DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 345 HE 024 392

AUTHOR Burn, Barbara B.
TITLE Raising the Curtain. A Report with Recommendations on Academic Exchanges with East Central Europe and the USSR. East Central Europe Information Exchange Report 1.
INSTITUTION Institute of International Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 54p.; Paper prepared for the International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange and the International Association of Universities.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute of International Education, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Economic Factors; Financial Support; Higher Education; Information Needs; *International Cooperation; International Education; *International Educational Exchange; *International Programs; Political Influences; Resources; Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Europe (East); United States; *USSR

ABSTRACT

This report provides an overview of the changes in the development of academic exchange activity between the United States, the Soviet Union, and East Central Europe in the context of far-reaching reforms throughout the region. It also explores the factors which may facilitate or inhibit further growth in academic exchanges. The report begins with a discussion of the importance of a small number of national exchanges, particularly the Fulbright and International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) programs, which have been active since the 1960s. Next, several factors are mentioned which may tend to inhibit reciprocal activities in the short term, including difficulties in international travel and communication, the growing financial burden for East European institutions seeking to bear a portion of the cost of exchange activity, lack of proficiency in the host country language, and the fear of a "braindrain." The report then addresses the need for expanded information and financial resources to facilitate the development of productive academic links between the United States and partners in the region. Appendices include the Strategy of the Study, the Exchange Agreement Between the University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University, the U.S.S.R.-U.S. Exchange Agreements, and the East Central European-U.S. Exchange Agreements. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331345

EAST CENTRAL EUROPE INFORMATION EXCHANGE/REPORT 1

RAISING THE CURTAIN

A Report with Recommendations
on Academic Exchanges with
East Central Europe and the USSR

Barbara B. Burn
Associate Provost, International Programs
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

This report was prepared for the
International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange
and the International Association of Universities

Sponsored by
Council on International Educational Exchange
Institute of International Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

IIE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

HE 024 392

Table of Contents

Executive Summary III

Introduction 1
Methodology and Organization of the Study 3

International Educational Exchange and the 1989 Developments 5
The Political and Economic Context 5
Academic Exchange Trends 8

The Soviet Union 11
Some Lessons Learned 13
Problem Areas 15

The East Central European Countries 19
U.S. Higher Education Institutions' Interests in ECE Exchanges 20
ECE Higher Education Institutions' Interests in U.S. Exchanges 21
The Pattern of U.S. Participation in East Central European Exchanges 22
Braindrain 24
Potential Participants 25
Differences in Educational Systems 26

Some Major Issues and Recommendations for the Future 29
Information Needs and Resources 29
Funding Needs and Resources 32
Recommendations 35

Appendix I: Strategy of the Study 39

Appendix II: Exchange Agreement Between the University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University 41

Appendix III: U.S.S.R.-U.S. Exchange Agreements 45

Appendix IV: ECE-U.S. Exchange Agreements 49

Raising the Curtain
Copyright © 1991 by the Institute of International Education.
All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

Executive Summary

The publication of *Raising the Curtain* culminates two years of research by Barbara Burn, Associate Provost for International Programs at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. Commissioned in March 1989 by the Institute of International Education (IIE) and the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE), the report is a timely and illuminating overview of changes in the development of academic exchange activity between the United States, U.S.S.R., and East Central Europe in the context of far-reaching reforms throughout the region. Drawing on consultations with key individuals in East-West exchange and extensive visits to institutions in the U.S.S.R. and Central Europe, Dr. Burn discusses factors which may facilitate or inhibit further growth in academic exchanges.

Opening her report with a historical survey of exchanges with the region, Dr. Burn observes the importance of a small number of national exchanges–particularly the Fulbright and IREX programs–which have been active since the 1960s. Fostering continuing contact between the academic and diplomatic communities in the U.S. and Eastern Europe–even during difficult political periods–these programs helped to hasten reform movements in several countries and have created the framework for productive longterm American academic and political relations with the region. Indeed, many East European participants in these programs have assumed prominent roles in ongoing political and economic transformations in their societies.

The last several years have seen a great increase in the exchange of students, scholars, and information between the United States and the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. Since the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Geneva summit meeting of 1985 and legislation introduced in 1988 enabling Soviet higher education institutions to establish independent relations with partners outside the Warsaw Pact, growing numbers of U.S. colleges and universities are seeking direct links with Soviet partners. Dr. Burn notes that U.S. institutions with active Soviet exchanges tend to have one or more of the following traits: membership in a U.S.-based consortium; a history of funding under Title VI of the Higher Education Act to promote Soviet and East European studies on campus; and a longstanding commitment to international education. Although the majority of existing agreements link U.S. institutions to counterparts in the Russian Republic, an increasing number of links are being established with institutions in non-Russian republics. IIE statistics cited in the report indicate that the number of Soviet students studying in the U.S. increased almost tenfold from 1987 to 1990.

Academic exchange activity with East Central Europe (ECE) has grown dramatically since the events of fall/winter 1989. Dr. Burn finds that increased activity has largely been motivated by East Central European institutions seeking to restructure curricula in various subjects, break their long isolation from international scholarship, and gain opportunities for faculty and students to live and study in the United States. New activity has largely centered on Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland (the last having a long history of academic collaboration with the U.S.), while Bulgaria, Romania, and Yugoslavia so far have attracted few new partners. In contrast to institutions

engaged in Soviet exchanges, U.S. colleges and universities with East Central European links have tended to develop direct reciprocal institutional relationships (rather than through consortial membership) and appear to be located near significant ethnic populations with roots in the ECE region.

Productive and mutually beneficial academic exchanges will undoubtedly develop between U.S. and East European partners in the future. Dr. Burn observes several factors, however, which may tend to inhibit reciprocal activities in the short term, including difficulties in international travel and communication, the growing financial burden for East European institutions seeking to bear a portion of the cost of exchange activity, lack of proficiency in the host country language, and the fear of a "braindrain." Many of these problems are particularly severe in the Soviet Union, where the ongoing shift in power from Moscow to the republics presents additional complications.

Turning to the future, Dr. Burn addresses the need for expanded information and financial resources to facilitate the development of productive academic links between the U.S. and partners in the region. A number of organizations and foundations with extensive Soviet and East Central European experience have initiated projects to disseminate information to American colleges and universities on the higher education systems and institutions in various countries or to advise students and scholars in the region on opportunities to study at U.S. colleges and universities. These efforts should be expanded and coordinated to meet the needs of a growing constituency in the United States, the U.S.S.R., and East Central Europe.

Dr. Burn underscores the urgent need for increased funding to expand academic exchanges with the region. Surveying the various U.S. government and private initiatives which have been launched to support new programs with the region, she finds that the majority are intended to encourage the development of market-driven economies and democratic institutions. She observes little prospect for dramatically increased funding for traditional longterm academic programs, despite their proven benefit to both the U.S. and Eastern Europe. In contrast to the rapid response on the part of the European Community to support academic exchanges through TEMPUS and other initiatives, the U.S. response has been perceived as "slow, uncoordinated, and inadequate."

In conclusion, Dr. Burn advocates the adoption of several measures to facilitate the development of academic links with the Soviet Union and East Central Europe:

- Increased U.S. federal funding for national and institution-based academic exchanges with the U.S.S.R. and East Central Europe.
- A U.S.-based clearinghouse focusing on academic linkages between the U.S. and countries in the region.
- A continuing active role for the International Research and Exchanges Board in exchange activity.
- Support for the study of East Central European languages in the U.S.
- Assistance for jointly designed programs with and for East European university administrators–both to enhance their professional skills and to build collaboration between U.S. and ECE higher education institutions.

Introduction

Dramatic changes have occurred in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe since March 1989 when the writer agreed to undertake a study of higher education or academic exchanges between those regions and the United States. This study is one of several on exchanges proposed by the Secretary General of the International Association of Universities (IAU). The proposal was endorsed by the International Committee for the Study of Educational Exchange (ICSEE). This study has been jointly sponsored by the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) and the Institute of International Education (IIE), both headquartered in New York City.

Because higher education exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union and East Central Europe were, for most of the countries, limited and difficult before the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, the "velvet revolution" in Czechoslovakia, and various comparable developments elsewhere in the region, this study as originally conceived would have reported considerable stagnation in exchanges for most of the countries along with many obstacles and frustrations. It would, however, be inaccurate to suggest that the environment for and interest in academic exchanges were entirely unfavorable and negative before the major developments in the region mentioned above. In this connection, Allen Kassof, Executive Director of the International Research Exchanges Board (IREX), two years before these developments commented that:

> Western, but especially American scholars, many of whom until recently were seen by Soviet and East European authorities as figures to be kept at a distance from real information, now are being welcomed, because they can help fill the vacuum of ideas and techniques created by decades of rigidly enforced doctrine.[1]

The dramatic changes since this study was agreed to have transformed it in aim and content. Instead of documenting a mostly low level of activity, it reports a veritable proliferation. Instead of detailing the former stagnation, it seeks to identify factors likely to inhibit or facilitate future growth and viability in academic exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union and East Central Europe.

The phrase "East Central Europe" (ECE) is used to refer to the region or regions variously identified as Eastern or Southeastern Europe and Central Europe but not the Soviet Union (also a focus of this study). The countries from those regions included in this study are the former East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Romania, and Bulgaria.

---

[1]International Research & Exchanges Board, *Annual Report 1987-1988*, Princeton, New Jersey: IREX, 1989, p. 7.

Because of its continuing, though recently less rigid, isolation from the outside world and the absence of any academic exchanges with U.S. higher education, Albania is not discussed in this study. Just which countries fall in Eastern or Central Europe has been shifting since the 1989 events, as countries formerly seen as part of Eastern Europe now prefer to define themselves as part of Central Europe.

For purposes of this report, academic or higher education exchange includes collaborative or exchange relationships between higher education institutions under which the institutions may exchange scholars, researchers, staff, and graduate and/or undergraduate students. Not included, therefore, is academic interchange, which, while involving university professors, does not involve reciprocal exchanges or "swaps" between the institutions. The Fulbright and IREX programs, although discussed briefly to show trends, are hence not a focus of this study. However, the experience of these organizations has been indispensable in the collection of data and in identifying important policy issues, because of their major role in two-way exchanges, even though these have not been reciprocal on an inter-institutional basis. In fact in the early 1980's IREX handled at least ninety percent of all academic exchanges between the United States and the regions concerned.

Also not included in this study, but clearly an important part of the context of academic exchanges, is the increasing flow of American professors to the Soviet Union and ECE, who are advising the governments and other organizations, including universities, on such subjects as pollution-control, the functioning of market economies, and democratic and constitutional reforms, but not as part of any academic exchange arrangements. Secondary school exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union, already involving hundreds of pupils, while not in the purview of this report, are also of importance in strengthening the mutual interest and receptivity to increasing contacts of all kinds, including academic. Nor is the enrollment of individual students from either region in higher education institutions in the other, although a striking recent development, discussed in this paper except as part of other activities or to show trends.

A notable gap in this study is the omission of academic exchanges involving academies of science and comparable bodies in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. This omission stems from the wish of the International Association of Universities (IAU) Secretariat that this and two parallel studies focus on inter-university cooperation and exchange. It was hoped that these studies might identify successful exchange models pertinent to IAU's concern to expand inter-university exchanges among southern hemisphere countries.

Important as is the encouragement of more inter-university collaboration, in leaving out the academies of science in the U.S.S.R. and East Central Europe, this study omits a major segment of academic exchange. Although generalizations about the countries concerned may be misleading, as is discussed later, nevertheless one can reasonably assert that the academies of science in these countries have played a vital role in academic exchanges with the United States. For example, while inter-university collaboration between Bulgaria and the United States has been very limited (until 1990), the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences has actively encouraged exchanges of scholars since signing an exchange agreement in 1963 with IREX's predecessor organization. A major reason why the academies played an important role in exchanges compared to the universities is that the academies, not the universities, received state funds to support exchanges.

The separation of teaching and research in the Soviet Union and East Central European countries also resulted in exchanges of scholars with the United States involving academies

rather than the universities. Visiting American scholars were more likely to be attracted to the research institutes attached to academies of science, in order to pursue their research, than to the universities, which have had little funding for research.

Methodology and Organization of the Study

The approaches used in preparing this report are presented in **Appendix I**. It should be emphasized that the rapid pace of change in East Central Europe, in addition to giving this report more urgency and greatly enlarging its content, threatens to make much of it obsolete even before it is published. Nonetheless, it is hoped that it may be of interest as a "snapshot" at a moment in time, and in pointing out some considerations likely to have long-term implications for academic exchanges between the countries concerned.

To the extent that this study offers generalizations about the countries included in it, these must be treated cautiously because of the considerable differences between the countries' histories, cultural traditions, and political and economic situations, all of which have major implications for academic exchanges with the United States. Yugoslavia's break with the Soviet Union in 1948 and its self-management approach to economic enterprises differentiated it so much from the rest of the region prior to the major political changes of 1989 that it did not, in fact, consider itself part of the region. At another extreme, whereas prior to the opening of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, a physical and metaphorical barrier between East and West Germany, the German Democratic Republic was among the more rigidly governed and isolated from the West of Warsaw Pact nations, little more than one year later it no longer exists, but is part of a unified Germany.

In understanding some of the differences between the East Central European countries, it is important to recognize that for historical and cultural reasons they fall into two main groups. In the first are Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. Along with Austria and the Republic of Slovenia in Yugoslavia, they remain part of an ancient Central European civilization whose intellectual attachments are to Western Europe, to Roman or Reformation Christianity, and to Renaissance and later Western cultural traditions and values. Eastern or Southeastern European countries, comprising the Balkan states of Bulgaria, Romania, and the rest of Yugoslavia (plus Albania and Greece), share a common historical experience from having been part of the Ottoman Empire, and before that of the Byzantine Eastern Roman Empire, and a common religious tradition—the Eastern Christian. These various early differences and legacies have their impacts on the level and development of the educational systems of the two clusters of countries, the Central European having a longer tradition and a more advanced higher education system than the countries of Eastern or Southeastern Europe.

An obvious organizational structure for this paper would be to present the educational exchange situation of each of the countries *seriatim*. While that structure is followed in part, the many commonalities among the higher education exchanges and systems of the East Central European countries justify organizing part of this paper on the basis of various issues and circumstances shared between several or more of the countries, such as financial constraints, faculty development, the non-mesh or differences between the higher education systems of the United States and East Central Europe, and the like.

Before the exchange situations of the Soviet Union and East Central Europe are presented, various developments and circumstances relevant to educational exchanges in the region are discussed— the 1989 developments, the political and economic context, and academic exchange trends for the last ten or more years.

International Educational Exchange and the 1989 Developments

While the major political developments in East Central Europe in the fall/winter of 1989 were brought about by many factors, among which *glasnost* and *perestroika* in the Soviet Union were certainly consequential, an important motivator was the growing frustration of scholars. Professor Hannes Adomeit of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy identifies this situation with the changes in his comments on the convergence of the need of the East Central Europe countries to relate more to and be part of the rest of the world with the interest of their scholars in international access and mobility. Adomeit mentions this interest in "unrestricted access to research materials and opportunity to travel abroad and participate in international conferences and scholarly exchanges." Particularly relevant is Adomeit's observation that "the objective needs of the state have been reinforced by scholars' interests in becoming part of an international community of scholars." [2]

The academic exchanges taking place in the years preceding the 1989 events responded to, as well as sustained, the interest in such exchanges in the East Central Europe region. As IREX's Director of East European Programs noted,

> Past IREX participants can be found in the party central committee of several countries in East Europe, in ministerial posts and also in the policy-making hierarchies of educational institutions and academies of sciences. The placement of former grantees in decision-making bodies is certain to have a positive impact on the exchange process.[3]

The Political and Economic Context

Exciting as is the "end of communism" in much of East Central Europe and the Soviet Union, the forty-year legacy of the regime, the suddenness with which it was ousted, and the devastating impact it had on the economies of the countries concerned seem likely to threaten the stability of the region for some time to come. This affects academic exchanges in several ways.

The prospect of a sojourn in the United States, no longer prohibited for nearly all academics by Soviet and East Central European central authorities, and, therefore, at least in prin-

[2]Hannes Adomeit, "Scholars Have Played a Key Role in Initiating and Interpreting the Changes Sweeping Europe," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol XXXVI, No. 15 (December 13, 1989), p A64.

[3]Vivian T. Abbott, "Report of the Director of East European Programs," *International Research & Exchanges Board: Annual Report 1987-1988*, Princeton New Jersey: IREX, 1989, p. 9.

ciple within the realm of possibility for students and scholars in these countries, is all the more attractive because of the long deprivation. For U.S. scholars and students, the new accessibility of the region and the fact that dramatic changes are underway there, which they might observe or even participate in or assist with, has enormous appeal. Other factors may, however, have negative impacts on academic exchanges. The political uncertainties and instability in much of the Soviet Union and East Central Europe, coupled with the extremely difficult living conditions, may, as is discussed later, deter U.S. scholars and students from going or spending much time there. The financial problems plaguing most of these countries will severely limit their students and scholars from pursuing studies or research in the United States.

The political and economic situation in the East Central European countries presents, of course, a wide diversity. Considerable unpredictability faces Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, just to take two examples. In the former, the June 1990 elections provoked protests and demonstrations leading to the president's ouster and presaging yet other changes, while in Yugoslavia, where the Communist Party action of January 1990 made possible the first free elections in that country in decades, ethnic strife and nationalist rivalries among the six republics threaten future order. Political stability seems likely in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary unless major economic hardship provokes protests, while the unification of East and West Germany into a single German state should assure relative stability for the former.

Romania may experience a more difficult transition—from the extremely repressive Ceausescu regime—than some of its neighbors because of the lingering legacy of that regime and the efforts of managers or functionaries—appointed by the party under Ceausescu and still in some of the bureaucracies (the so-called Nomenklatura)—to resist or frustrate changes sought by the new government. In the Soviet Union, since glasnost and perestroika, the drive for autonomy or even secession on the part of various republics and a widespread dissatisfaction with mounting shortages of food and consumer goods make likely some significant changes or increased unrest in the not distant future.

The likelihood that the economic circumstances of the Soviet Union and much of East Central Europe will deteriorate further before a shift to something closer to a market-based economy stimulates productivity is not auspicious for expanded international academic exchanges. Even the former East Germany, despite major help from West Germany, is projected to require ten to fifteen years to achieve Western living standards.

Although the economic situation among the Soviet Union and East Central European countries varies considerably, throughout the region the Stalinist central planning techniques resulted in low productivity, slow economic growth, and technological obsolescence. Czechoslovakia is having a much easier time moving away from Communist economics than some of the others, because it started from a more advanced position. Hungary's credit remains solid, Poland and Yugoslavia have mostly choked off inflation (but rising oil prices are triggering its resumption), and in all four of these countries the stores are full. But prices are high, approaching those of the West and beyond the reach of lower income groups. A substantial foreign debt burdens some of the countries: nearly $40 billion for Poland, $18 billion for Hungary, $16 billion for Bulgaria, $6.7 billion for Czechoslovakia, and nearly $20 billion inherited from East Germany by the new united Germany.

Bulgaria, a country formerly self-sufficient agriculturally before the Soviet-enforced massive industrialization, faces mounting shortages of basic food stuffs and other consumer goods. Romania is becoming even more a "third world" country in its standard of living than Bulgaria. With its economy and industry devastated by Ceausescu's campaign of heavy

forced exports and slashed imports in order to end foreign indebtedness ($11 billion in 1982), Romania is expected to have the most difficulty of the East Central European nations in developing a market-oriented economy.

Prospects for the economy of the Soviet Union are far from assured. With an inflation rate of at least ten percent, a gross national product estimated to be only one-third to one-half that of the United States (or only one-seventh, according to some Soviet experts), and with a foreign debt of some $45 billion, the Soviet Union is sorely challenged to provide the more abundant life which is a promise of perestroika. The challenge is exacerbated by the new realization by the Soviet people, as a consequence of glasnost, of how far they lag compared to the West.

The intractability of many problems faced by the Soviet economy adds to the government's dilemma of how fast and deeply it can and should shift the economy towards a market model. Central planning has been discredited, and the Soviet economic system has more or less collapsed, threatening to undermine Gorbachev's authority and credibility. While the economic changes underway or in prospect are already stimulating increased U.S.-Soviet exchanges in the fields of economics, business, and management, the same situation may deter exchanges in other fields, because of the resultant austerity of living standards and other conditions.

In general, in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe, privatization of the economy, even if only partial, will inevitably entail substantial social costs. The phasing out of state subsidies, the laying-off of unproductive workers, and the closing down of obsolete factories and other enterprises will bring mounting unemployment, as already, for example, in East Germany and Poland. Rising inflation and the growing disparities in wealth among the population may prompt popular unrest. Exacerbating the situation for the East Central Europe countries is their long-standing trade dependence on the Soviet Union for some seventy percent of imports and exports. New Soviet demands for payment in hard currency and finding other trading partners to replace the U.S.S.R. will require wrenching adjustments on the part of the East Central Europe countries. With the almost inevitable worsening of their economies—further stricken by the high oil prices brought on by the Gulf crisis—whether or not their newly elected democratic governments can resist the pressures of population groups threatened or affected by economic reforms will be significant to their political stability.

Just how important the possibility of political instability and the reality of shortages of basic consumer goods (in some of the East Central European countries more than others) may be to U.S. students and scholars is hard to predict. Certainly, for many American scholars, especially those involved with Soviet and East European fields, the new Soviet openness presents an extraordinary opportunity both for access to research materials and for working with colleagues in the countries concerned. For faculty in such fields as economics, management, industrial organization and the like, the professional opportunity to lecture and consult in their field at Soviet and ECE higher education institutions (and with other organizations, including enterprises) is professionally extremely gratifying. It is estimated that as of Fall 1990 well over thirty U.S. schools of business were involved in programs in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. For many students from the United States—graduate and undergraduate and in a range of disciplines—the new opportunity to study and pursue research in the U.S.S.R. and East Central Europe countries offers an excitement which, for scholars, seems likely, at least in the short term, to more than counterbalance concerns about economic hardship and possible political instability.

Academic Exchange Trends

Although comprehensive and reliable data are not available on the numbers of U.S. and East Central European students and scholars participating in exchanges in the last decade and more, the following tables document the increasing student flows, especially from East Central Europe to the United States. This is the case even though the dramatic changes taking place in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe are too recent for their full impact to be reported in publications regularly issued on study, research, and teaching abroad by U.S. and foreign students and scholars.

STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM EASTERN EUROPE
SELECTED YEARS, 1960-1990[4]

	1960-61	1974-75	1977-78	1987-88	1989-90
Albania	1	10	5	2	1
Bulgaria	1	10	3	40	75
Czechoslovakia	7	**90**	26	64	87
German Dem. Rep.	NA	—	2	19	22
Hungary	53	47	23	**190**	**440**
Poland	78	**260**	**280**	**740**	**1,010**
Romania	3	**110**	40	72	120
Soviet Union	39	35	**160**	77	**510**
Yugoslavia	110	**310**	**360**	**750**	**1,070**
EASTERN EUROPE TOTAL	292	**900**	**970**	**2,000**	**3,360**

Unfortunately, data on U.S. students studying in the East Central European countries are sparse. The collection of data on foreign students in the United States by IIE has been more regular and extensive than the collection of data on U. S. students studying abroad. Comparing recent with earlier data is also difficult because whereas in the last several years IIE has begun collecting study abroad data on the basis of numbers of students, before that it collected data based on numbers of study abroad programs for which U.S. colleges and universities granted academic credit.

Nevertheless, the trend towards increasing study abroad by U.S. students in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe countries can be illustrated as follows:

- In 1978-79, of the total of 801 U.S. study abroad programs reported by IIE which enrolled 24,471 U.S. students, only fourteen involved the Soviet Union and Eastern Central Europe.[5]

- Assuming an average enrollment per program of thirty students, only about 420 students studied in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe in 1978-79, and only 60 of them in the two programs in the U.S.S.R. The other programs were located in Poland (10), Hungary (1), and Yugoslavia (1).[5]

---

[4]All figures are from *Open Doors*, an annual publication of the Institute of International Education, New York, and are based on a survey of all accredited U.S. colleges and universities. Numbers in bold face type indicate extrapolated totals. Because regional totals as well as country totals are extrapolated in *Open Doors*, the sum of all the individual countries within the region for a given year will not equal the regional totals in bold face type.
[5] IIE, *Open Doors 1978-79*, pp. 78-79.

- In 1985-86, 535 U.S. students received credit for study in the Soviet Union—1.1% of all study abroad students and more than in any of the ECE countries. [6]

- In 1987-88, 693 U.S. students received credit for study in the Soviet Union—1.3% of all study abroad students and more than in any of the ECE countries. [7]

For 1990-91, the number of U.S. students pursuing studies in the Soviet Union and the ECE countries is sharply higher, although exact figures are difficult to obtain. A number of new programs have been launched, especially in Prague, Budapest, Warsaw, and the Soviet Union. From a level of only around 300-400 U.S. students pursuing studies in the East Central European countries prior to 1986 (there were then only three programs for U.S. students in the Soviet Union compared to close to fifty some four years later), for 1990-91, the number of U. S. college students in the U.S.S.R. and ECE probably exceeds 1,000.

An important group of U.S. students who are too often overlooked in study abroad assessments are the advanced graduate students supported to pursue doctoral dissertation research abroad under the Fulbright Program administered by the U.S. Department of Education. For the period 1964-86, those going to the U.S.S.R. and East Central Europe totaled 404 (232 to the U.S.S.R.), a number which compares favorably with the number of U.S. students receiving U.S.I.A.-administered student Fulbright awards for the longer period of 1949-86, 921 (445 to the U.S.S.R.). [8]

FULBRIGHT SCHOLAR EXCHANGE SELECTED YEARS
TO U. S. FROM EASTERN EUROPE/FROM U. S. TO EASTERN EUROPE

	1960-61[9]	1985-86[10]	1989-90[11]	1990-91[12]
Bulgaria	-/-	7/6	9/8	11/5
Czechoslovakia	2/0	9/7	26/16	16/19
German Dem. Rep.			8/5	10/5
Hungary		9/8	30/20	25/29
Poland		21/16	48/23[13]	40/20
Romania		30/12	9/9	12/10
Soviet Union	15/1	22/22	25/28	39/23
Yugoslavia	17/1	43/44	51/27	38/24
TOTAL	34/2	141/115	207/131	191/153

As indicated by its title, the above table only includes scholars and researchers funded under the USIA-administered Fulbright Program, and, in fact, does not include all Fulbright scholar awardees. Those funded under the Fulbright Program administered by the U.S.

---

[6]IIE, *Open Doors 1986-87*, p.81

[7]IIE, *Open Doors 1988-89*, p.82

[8]Board of Foreign Scholarships, *Forty Years, The Fulbright Program 1946-1986*, Washington, D.C., December 1986, pp. 37, 44

[9]IIE, *Open Doors 1960*, pp. 28-29. The numbers in this column are not limited to Fulbright Scholars only, and were obtained from a 1959 survey of 2,034 U.S. institutions.

[10]Board of Foreign Scholarships, *Forty Years*, p.36.

[11]Council for International Exchange of Scholars, *Fulbright Scholar Program, 1989 Annual Report*, Washington, D.C., 1990, p.23.

[12]CIES, *Visiting Fulbright Scholars and Occasional Lecturers, 1990-91 Directory*, Volume I, Washington, D.C., 1990, pp. 100-109. These figures are incomplete as Volume II of the Directory, published mid-winter, will list additional scholars. Information on U.S. scholars in the ECE countries was obtained directly from CIES.

[13]The total of 48 visiting scholars from Poland includes 9 Alexander Hamilton Fellows, funded by the Fulbright program under the Presidential Initiative for Eastern Europe announced in 1989 to provide opportunities for young business managers from Eastern Europe to learn about the functioning of a free-market economy.

Department of Education are in addition. In fiscal year 1986, eight U.S. faculty members received research grants (two for the GDR and six for the U.S.S.R.), three group projects with a total of 324 participants were funded for the U.S.S.R., 2 with 31 participants for Poland, and three foreign curriculum consultants were funded to be at U.S. colleges and universities (two from the U.S.S.R. and one from Yugoslavia). [14]

The foregoing tables help show the context of inter-university academic exchanges and the increasing number of participants, especially since the mid-1980s. In the exchange of scholars, the International Research and Exchanges Board has continued to play the dominant role, supporting some 350 persons yearly from the United States and the Soviet Union and East Central Europe for individual exchanges in the other region/country. This is quite apart from the activity of the IREX commissions with academies of science and other scholarly organizations in the U.S.S.R. and ECE countries which bring together specialists to work on joint projects.

[14]Board of Foreign Scholarships, *Forty Years*, p.44

The Soviet Union

Higher education exchanges between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States have increased enormously since the November 1985 summit meeting in Geneva between Ronald Reagan and Mikhail S. Gorbachev. In Geneva, the two presidents signed an agreement to extend the scientific, cultural, and educational exchanges first approved in 1958, negotiations for the extension of which had been suspended in 1979 with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. A dramatic shift from the past was the agreement of the two leaders to expand people-to-people initiatives and to encourage much more international exchange of high school and college students and teachers, and youth generally, as well as sister-city and other locally-based groups.

Since 1985 the combination of new exchange agreements, glasnost in the U.S.S.R., and the people-to-people initiative has brought greatly increased exchanges of many kinds. Whereas, as of 1988, the number of Soviet scholars pursuing long-term research (up to one year) in the United States under IREX had for some years been about forty per year, in that year the Soviet authorities urged that the number be increased to up to 100 for 1989 and to 200 or even more for 1990-91. The number of U. S. scholars who have spent an appreciable period of time in the Soviet Union, fewer then ten in 1956, up to around 1000 by 1969, is now estimated at well over 4,000.

Apart from the warming of U.S.-Soviet relations, probably the most important factor in expanding academic exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States was the Soviet decision in March 1988 to delegate to the universities the authority to negotiate international exchanges directly with counterpart institutions abroad. This change encouraged U.S. universities to approach potential Soviet counterparts directly to work out exchange agreements, and made it possible for Soviet institutions to initiate exchange negotiations with U. S. universities. The letter of the rector of one higher education institution in the Soviet Union to his U.S. counterpart proposing an exchange made explicit the importance of the Geneva summit and the possibility of initiatives from the Soviet side. He wrote:

> I am writing with reference to the agreements arrived at in the talks that took place between the governments of the USSR and the USA concerning the improvement and broadening of contacts between the students of our two countries. (Our institution now has) the opportunity of having a direct exchange of students with one of the American universities... The purpose of such an

exchange is the establishment of direct contacts between students of our countries in the spirit of the Soviet-American talks.

Prior to the 1985 Geneva summit, agreements for academic exchanges between U.S. and Soviet institutions of high education were extremely rare. The State University of New York (SUNY) has had an exchange of undergraduate students, ten each way annually for one semester periods, with the Thorez Institute of Foreign Languages (now renamed the Moscow Linguisitics University) in Moscow since 1974, and an exchange of faculty members and graduate students with Moscow State University (MGU) since 1977. The latter was expanded in 1988 to include undergraduates, joint research projects and publications, exchanges of foreign language instructors, and annual conferences.

The Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., (MUCIA) consisting of eight member institutions and headquartered at Ohio State University, also has had exchanges with MGU since 1980 of faculty members and graduate students and including undergraduates in the last few years. The 1979 exchange between the University of Lowell in Massachusetts and Tbilisi State University in the Republic of Georgia is the only other U.S.-Soviet exchange agreement pre-dating the 1985 summit known to the writer. As is not uncommon with exchange agreements, its initiation was motivated in large measure because of the commitment and enthusiasm of a Lowell professor who taught at Tbilisi on a Fulbright. The Lowell-Tbilisi agreement is relatively typical of U.S.-Soviet inter-institutional agreements except that unlike more recent ones it does not specify the dollars and rubles to be provided by host institutions; a copy of the agreement can be found in **Appendix II**.

A review of exchange agreements as of mid-1990, even though it is inevitably incomplete because the field is changing so rapidly, while revealing a wide range of U.S. institutional "partners," shows a not surprising configuration. The U.S. institutions fall into the following five categories:

1) most of the universities where the twenty centers for Soviet and East European Studies (their names differ) funded under Title VI of the Higher Education Act are located;
2) a number of other comprehensive, distinguished universities, private and public;
3) institutions with long-standing strong commitments to international education and exchange;
4) institutions linked in consortia for purposes of Soviet exchanges or for quite different reasons, and
5) colleges and universities not fitting the foregoing categories but also concerned to have their Soviet involvement.

Appendix III lists those exchange arrangements identified by the writer.

With respect to the first category, it is interesting that although the universities with Title VI Centers for Soviet Studies in most cases have an exchange arrangement with a Soviet institution, rarely have the centers entered into such agreements. One can speculate that this is because of the effective decline in Title VI funding with inflation over the years, or because without formal exchange agreements, there has nevertheless been considerable scholarly mobility involving Center and Soviet professors and researchers, made possible by IREX, Fulbright, and other funding.

Consortial approaches to academic exchanges have the strong advantages of sharing exchange opportunities among a number of U.S. institutions and bringing greater leverage to bear than might a single U.S. institution. Major examples of these include the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA); the undergraduate student exchange initiated in 1988 which is coordinated by Middlebury College; the Citizen Exchange Council of New York City which, since 1987, has paired more than a dozen higher education institutions each in the Soviet Union and the United States for exchange programs; and the American Council of Teachers of Russian. ACTR, since at least 1987, has entered into official agreements with the relevant Soviet ministries to make possible the offering of language training programs for teachers and students from each country at higher education institutions in the other, as well as joint research and the cooperative development of teaching materials. Through ACTR, the University of Iowa, to take just one example, hosts Soviet students without the burden and complexities of having to negotiate its own agreement with a Soviet institution.

The ASPIA exchange involves thirteen U.S. graduate schools (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, School of Advanced International Studies, Georgetown School of Foreign Service, the Woodrow Wilson School, etc.) in an exchange of mainly students but also some faculty and researchers with the Moscow State Institute for International Relations and the Diplomatic Academy of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the key Soviet institutions which train specialists for the diplomatic career. First implemented in 1990-91, the numbers exchanged are carefully balanced.

In the Middlebury College exchange, known as the American Collegiate Consortium, the college coordinates swaps of fifty each Soviet and American undergraduates between higher education institutions in the two countries for a full academic year period, with only two students going to each host institution. When launched, the exchange was unique in offering an "unchaperoned" and immersion experience in the host institutions. In 1988-89, the host U.S. colleges and universities were required to waive accommodation, board, and tuition costs for the Soviet students and to provide them with a $150 monthly stipend, while the Soviet host institutions had a comparable obligation. A possible problem in the Middlebury program is the high cost to the U.S. colleges of hosting Soviet students. Another emerging problem is the growing reluctance of the participating private U.S. colleges to require full tuition and other costs from their students for the year in the Soviet Union when the conditions of learning and living are so behind levels in the United States. Unique features of the Middlebury program are that at least one-third of the Soviet exchange students must be women, they should not be older than twenty-three years, and they cannot take more than half of their courses at the host institutions in their major.

The Citizen Exchange Council has been instrumental in pairing U.S. and Soviet institutions for exchanges of undergraduates. Initially involving periods of only a few weeks, the pairings have since led to on-going exchanges for longer periods.

Even though the Soviet programs of the Council on International Educational Exchange are not reciprocal, its Russian language program offered at Leningrad State University since 1966 should be mentioned for its age and size and also because it involves an academic consortium of thirty-five U.S. colleges and universities.

SOME LESSONS LEARNED

The following generalizations about academic exchanges between the United States and

the Soviet Union attempt to reflect and take into account interviews with a wide range of persons involved in academic exchanges from both countries. They further take into account the text of a number of formal exchange agreements, because many institutions made copies available to the writer, although for confidential use only. It is more for such reasons that the following comments may be useful, not for any startling new insights that they contain.

- Overwhelmingly, the Soviet institutions with which U.S. colleges and universities have entered into exchange agreements have been in Moscow and Leningrad, with the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic in third place. As the number of agreements increase and higher education institutions in other republics seek exchanges with the United States, and with the trend towards decentralization in the Soviet Union, more U.S. colleges and universities are seeking links with institutions in the non-Russian republics, as are the higher education institutions in the non-Russian republics with U.S. institutions.

- Exchange agreements between U.S. and Soviet higher education institutions are a very recent development. As of mid-1990 many were still in the planning stage or just being implemented as far as the U.S. institutions were concerned, while, in the Soviet Union, new proposals and initiatives have emerged with impressive rapidity.

- The ubiquitous model for exchanges is the so-called "tit-for-tat." Each institution agrees to provide virtually the same treatment to visiting scholars and students sent by the partner. The two institutions aim to exchange equal numbers of different categories of persons for the same (though not necessarily coinciding) time periods. A recent trend, however, is for the Soviet institutions to host more persons, especially students, than they send to their U.S. collaborators so that the latter are asked to pay for the "overage" in dollars.

- The time period which students and/or scholars spend in the host country is becoming longer, especially for students, more likely a semester than a shorter period and increasingly for a full academic year.

- The level of support provided by the Soviet and U.S. institutions to scholars and students from their partner institutions varies considerably. To illustrate, depending on the exchange agreement, the support for Soviet professors during their period at their host U.S. institution can vary from free meals, housing, and insurance plus $10 per day, to free housing and insurance and $32 per day for food and cultural programs, to free housing and insurance and $500 per month for other living expenses. The amounts that the Soviet institutions require of their American partners per extra U.S. student beyond the exchange balance vary from around $300 per month to $1000 (far more than, for example, the $1000 for a full year which some foreign students pay at the University of Peoples' Friendship, Patrice Lumumba, though most are fully subsidized).

- The U.S. colleges and universities exchanging graduate students and faculty members with Soviet institutions have, in probably close to half of the cases, depended on outside funding to help meet extra costs—from the U.S. Information Agency, U.S. Department of Education, IREX, Fulbright, foundations, and other sources, public and private. There are, of course, some major exceptions: colleges and universities which have supported exchanges from their internal budgets.

- The study and research fields of the Soviet and U.S. exchangees diverged importantly until very recently. Whereas the Soviet scholars and researchers were concentrated in the sciences and engineering until the last year or so, more now wish to pursue studies and

research in the United States in business and management as well as in economics, and in the social sciences, including sociology.

While U.S. scholars and students who pursue research or studies in the Soviet Union still tend to concentrate on aspects of Soviet society, culture, language, and the like, more are beginning to go into fields which may be problem areas in both countries: pollution, education, health care, etc.

PROBLEM AREAS

Some of the foregoing trends and developments in exchanges between U.S. and Soviet institutions and the sheer increasing number of these exchanges (and of travel between the two countries of escalating numbers of tourists, business people, and others) have brought with them various problems. While some problems are doubtless only transitional and temporary, others may be significant in the long term. Thirteen problem areas are presented below.

1. Communication between Soviet and U.S. institutions seeking to negotiate or implement academic exchanges is apt to be time-consuming, expensive, and frustrating. Letters sent air mail often take a month to arrive, Fax and telex are underdeveloped in the Soviet Union, and telephoning can involve long hours of effort and delay.

2. Air travel between the two countries is impeded by the insufficient capacity of carriers relative to demand and by the Aeroflot requirement that all tickets be purchased in hard currency, unless purchased at least one year in advance of the intended trip and only then for a limited number of seats per flight. Air travel problems result in late and/or unpredictable arrivals in the United States of Soviet scholars and students, thereby adding to costs for the U.S. institutions, delaying the integration of the Soviet visitors into programs planned for them, and implying a lack of serious commitment to the exchanges on the part of the Soviets. As with so many aspects of educational exchanges, each side suspects that its foreign counterpart has not measured up to expectations, whether for deliberate or unintended reasons.

3. The escalating interest in exchanges of all kinds between the United States and the Soviet Union has put an enormous burden on the visa-issuing process in both directions. The Soviet Consular office in Washington, D.C. requires at least several weeks to issue a visa, while in Moscow the U.S. Embassy rejects applications received less than twenty-one days in advance.

4. The replacement in the Soviet Union in March 1988 of the three principal organizations dealing with education (the All Union Ministry for Higher and Specialized Secondary Education, the All Union Ministry of Education, and the State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education) with the State Committee on Public Education, although aimed at reducing the bureaucracy and delays associated with it, because it decreased the staff who handle exchanges, has resulted in more delays. The prospect as of late 1990 that jurisdiction over education, including higher education, would move from the All Union government to the fifteen republics seems likely to delay, at least initially, the expansion of student and scholar exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States. The republics lack experience in this field, as do U.S. higher education institutions in dealing with them and their universities and other post-secondary institutions.

5. The language barrier will continue to be a deterrent to exchanges, especially from the U.S. side, because of the continued low priority accorded to foreign language teaching in the

American education system. The increasing number of exchanges which offer high school students the chance to go to the Soviet Union over time should increase Russian studies at the secondary school level, thus preparing more students to study in the Soviet Union as undergraduates.

6. Financial factors will be for some time a major problem in U.S.-Soviet academic exchanges: the non-convertibility internationally of the ruble, the inflated official dollar-ruble exchange rate in the U.S.S.R., the difficulty U.S. scholars and students experience in using rubles to pay for some local costs while in the Soviet Union, the strong demand for dollars (by taxi drivers, merchants, etc.), the increasing cost of living in the Soviet Union, and, most recently, the new requirement that the hotel accommodation costs of visiting U.S. scholars be paid in dollars, even if they are hosted by a Soviet institution.

7. A possible trend towards the commercialization of academic exchanges which bring Americans to the Soviet Union may constitute an increasing problem, as the Soviet institutions negotiate for larger sums to host American students and for U.S. institutions' support of Soviet students and scholars while in the United States, thus driving up the price structure.

8. With the accelerating changes in the Soviet Union, many university professors and administrators are attempting to retool or strengthen their qualifications for important jobs in the newly evolving system. A number seek, for example, to study and consult in the United States in order to enhance their professional image. Others may try to become knowledgeable about a market economy so as to initiate joint ventures or teach in this field back home, thereby possibly skewing the original aims of whatever exchange agreement made possible their stay in the United States.

9. The general ferment and pace of change in the U.S.S.R. are resulting in frequent turnovers in the top staffing of Soviet institutions, including the staff who handle exchanges with U.S. institutions. In some cases, the American university person who coordinates academic exchanges with the U.S.S.R. may no longer know who his/her counterpart is and with whom to communicate. It is, in part, because of such problems and other bureaucratic delays that the Soros Foundation and IREX have set up their own offices in Moscow.

10. Differences or disjunctions between the Soviet and U.S. education systems, while not an impediment to academic exchanges, can inhibit their effectiveness. These differences call for efforts to provide a detailed understanding of the higher education system in the host country to exchange scholars and students. Chiefly involving differences in approaches to teaching and evaluation, independent study, and the availability of library and other resources for research, this point is elaborated on further in connection with the East Central European countries.

11. At a very practical level, and leaving aside Soviet restrictions on students going abroad, the exchange of students between the U.S.S.R. and the United States encounters deterrents with respect to Soviet students studying in the United States. They have considerable difficulty in obtaining transcripts of their academic record, letters of recommendations from their professors, extra copies of their diplomas (xerox machines are rare and not easily accessible), and in taking the TOEFL, GRE, and other such tests often required for foreign student admission to U.S. colleges and universities. Soviet students also have major problems in applying for these tests, because they are given in few locations, are relatively expensive in the U.S.S.R. context (GRE and TOEFL fees together exceed two months of a professional level salary), and require dollar payments unless voucher plans enable them to pay in rubles. Another obstacle to Soviet students studying in the United States is the deep concern about possible

brain drain; the U.S.S.R. fears losing one million specialists by the year 2000.

12. The competition in the United States for funding for academic exchanges with the USSR, discussed more later in connection with East Central Europe, is expected to be a continuing problem. Federal and other funds fall far short of meeting the demand. For example, one-third of the 160 IREX exchange slots available for American researchers going to the Soviet Union for 1989-90 were not filled because of a lack of funds. U.S. Information Agency funding for exchanges with the U.S.S.R. (Samantha Smith, the University Affiliation Program, and the Fulbright Program) have become increasingly competitive, as have the U.S. Department of Education programs which fund research and study relating to the Soviet Union.

13. A problem which is apt to grow with the increase of U.S.-Soviet academic exchanges is the understandable preference of some Soviet institutions to accept American scholars coming on a two-way exchange rather than as a one-way placement, because, unlike the former, the latter does not offer the *quid pro quo* of enabling a Soviet scholar, counterpart to the incoming American, to spend a period at the latter's institution, hosted and supported by it. This may make the placement of American scholars coming on a one-way basis, for example, funded by Fulbright or IREX, more difficult, especially at those Soviet institutions where housing accommodations for visiting scholars is limited.

Despite the assorted problems and issues confronting Soviet-U.S. academic exchanges, the American students and scholars who have participated have found the experience enormously rewarding. Among the many pluses are the opportunities now in the post-cold war era to engage in open discussion with the Soviet people on all kinds of topics, to experience the culture of Russia and other Soviet republics first hand—even visiting in the homes of Soviet families—and, as mentioned earlier, to have access to research possibilities that were far less available pre-1985. The quality of the Russian language programs, the overwhelming warmth and helpfulness of Soviet teachers and students, and the commitment of the Soviet institutions to exchanges constitute still other important pluses.

The East Central European Countries

To lump together Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, and East Germany (though, because of German's unification, East Germany receives less focus in this study) overlooks many differences among them. To illustrate: Yugoslavia has a longstanding Fulbright program; higher education institutions in Poland have received more support for academic exchanges with U.S. colleges and universities from USIA's University Affiliation Program than have all the other Warsaw Pact countries plus Yugoslavia; while Bulgaria apparently has only four exchange relationships with U.S. universities.

Also, while some of the East Central European countries have experienced in the last decades an almost impenetrable isolation from the West, including the United States—except, of course, through IREX-administered exchanges—in others, some East Central European academics were able to resist or circumvent this isolation, and sustain at least a small degree of scholarly communication with the United States. The impressive determination of individuals and organizations on both sides meant that the renewed contact with the West possible to the East Central European countries after fall/winter 1989, instead of facing a Rip Van Winkle scenario, could build on some pre-existing interest and experience. In this connection, Bulgaria and Romania merit special mention.

Since the 1989 events, exchange arrangements between U.S. and East Central European higher education institutions have increased, but much more in some countries than others. Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Romania have not seen a surge, Yugoslavia mainly because it has not been identified with the dramatically changed situation in East Central Europe (Yugoslavia pulled out of the Warsaw Pact in Tito's early years), and so has not generated the level of interest produced, for example, by Czechoslovakia's "velvet revolution." Bulgaria and Romania have not attracted more exchanges with U.S. universities, probably because of the combination of their difficult living conditions, paucity of collaborative research opportunities in many fields (especially those requiring significant laboratory equipment), some questions about their new political regimes, and the little knowledge in the United States about these countries. Other countries have been almost overwhelmed with the overtures of U.S. universities eager to establish international exchanges, especially Czechoslovakia and Hungary. U.S. exchanges with Polish universities, already numerous, have also increased.

An important "divider" between the East Central European countries' performance in academic exchanges with the United States has been whether individual universities in a country could independently enter into exchange relationships with U.S. (and other foreign) universities. Yugoslavian universities have long had this option, while universities in the other

countries have been able to act independently mainly since the 1989 changes. How real this new opportunity may be is questionable if, as so far seems too much the case, it is not accompanied by increased funding to support international academic exchanges.

U.S. Higher Education Institutions' Interests in ECE Exchanges

The interests of U.S. higher education institutions in collaborative schemes with counterparts in the East Central European countries appear to be the following:

- Hosting East Central European scholars in the United States in order to strengthen and extend home campus programs, especially in East Central European Studies, including the languages of the region, and in other fields as well, such as theatre, and to facilitate collaborative research in such fields as mathematics and the sciences;

- Sending their own scholars to East Central Europe, mainly for research and professional development purposes, again, especially in East Central European-related fields, but also in some others, at least for one visit;

- Assisting with the development and reform of East Central European higher education institutions and other organizations by sending American faculty for consulting and teaching, with emphasis on such fields as management, economics, democratic institutions and processes, and the functioning of a market-based economy;

- Contributing to the same objectives by offering to faculty members from ECE institutions the opportunity to pursue research, studies, and consulting in the United States in order to update and extend their professional knowledge in their areas of specialization;

- Bringing greater diversity to their foreign student populations by enrolling East Central European students at the undergraduate and/or graduate levels;

- Giving U.S. students the opportunity to study in ECE countries in order to expand their international education and their knowledge of the countries concerned, including their cultures, languages, and people;

- For U.S. higher education institutions located near significant ethnic communities having East Central European roots, building on and reinforcing their community links through exchanges with the East Central European countries;

- Maintaining or pursuing recognition in higher and international education circles for initiative, innovativeness, and responsiveness to changing opportunities and circumstances, and;

- So far, for only a few U.S. colleges and universities, generating extra funds by sending American students to East Central Europe, charging program fees or their regular home campus fees, both of which substantially exceed actual program costs, and using the surplus for purposes quite extraneous to the exchange rather than, for example, to support students/faculty in the United States from the East Central European exchange institutions.

ECE Higher Education Institutions' Interests in U.S. Exchanges

The interests of the ECE institutions in academic exchanges with U.S. colleges and universities are also reasonably predictable as well as quite different from those of the U.S. institutions. They include the following:

- To give their faculty, especially the younger generation and graduate students, a period in the United States, for the former to update and enlarge their knowledge in their professional fields—or even to acquire a new specialization—and for the latter, to pursue research or degree studies, taking advantage of the research facilities and knowledge base available in the United States;

- To host U.S. faculty and researchers, short or longer term, who, while at an ECE institution, might help in needed curriculum adaptation and development, in teaching special courses or seminars for students, in offering colloquia and seminars useful to East Central European faculty, and in consulting with relevant organizations in the host country, especially in the fields of economics, business and management, and, increasingly, in political philosophy and processes;

- To enable East Central European undergraduates to gain experience in carrying out independent study, in critical thinking, in proactive and interactive learning, and in making decisions (which is more characteristic of U.S. than ECE education) through studying for a semester or even for a degree at an American college or university;

- To encourage ECE students and faculty to improve their English proficiency through a period in the United States or by interacting with U.S. students and scholars coming to East Central Europe on exchange;

- To learn about higher education pedagogy, decision-making, and administration in the United States, including inter-institutional collaboration, not to serve as a model for the East Central European universities, but to suggest approaches which might involve more democratic and decentralized structures and procedures than have been common in some of the ECE higher education institutions and systems, and to share insights on the uses of new technology;

- To give East Central European faculty and scholars contact with "cutting edge" research in the United States, especially in fields such as computer science, biotechnology, materials science, and economics and business administration;

- To earn hard currency by offering study programs for U.S. students for which program fees are paid in dollars;

- To encourage U. S. colleges and universities to donate badly needed books, periodicals, videocassettes, laboratory equipment and supplies, and other educational resources to the ECE higher education institutions, and;

- For individual faculty members from both U.S. and East Central European higher education institutions to help meet their concern to acquire enhanced prestige, even leverage, at their home institutions through having had the opportunity for a scholarly sojourn abroad in the other geographic region.

The Pattern of U.S. Participation in East Central European Exchanges

While there are substantial similarities (and overlap) between the kinds of U.S. colleges and universities having exchanges with Soviet institutions and those having exchanges with East Central European institutions but not with the U.S.S.R., there are some interesting differences. They are similar in that both categories include: 1) a number of institutions with Title VI-funded Soviet and East European Studies Centers, 2) important representation of other distinguished comprehensive universities, including state universities and land-grant colleges, and 3) a number of institutions with well-known and longstanding commitments to international education and exchange.

The kinds of American institutions which have exchanges with East Central European countries other than the U.S.S.R. and can therefore be differentiated from them include: 1) institutions located in regions with significant ethnic populations whose roots are in ECE countries, 2) colleges and universities with active programs in particular fields or specialties which have much to gain from East Central European exchanges, for example, film programs from exchanges with Hungary, mathematics with Czechoslovakia, and Byzantine archaeology from exchanges with Bulgaria, 3) a number of U.S. colleges and universities whose East Central European links pre-date glasnost and the major changes in the region. Among the latter are the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (Bologna Center) exchange since 1974 with Jagiellonian University in Poland; Brown University's exchange since 1978 with Wilhelm Pieck University in Rostock, East Germany; Georgetown's link with the Central School of Planning and Statistics, Warsaw, started in 1973 and now administered by CIEE; Pittsburgh's exchange with Sofia University going back some eleven years; and Indiana University's exchange with the University of Warsaw since 1976. **Appendix IV** lists exchange relationships between U.S. and East Central European institutions.

In contrast to U.S.S.R.-U.S. academic exchanges, few consortia of American institutions have exchanges with the East Central European countries. The main exceptions are the International Student Exchange Program (ISEP), which administers student exchanges with two universities in Hungary, and the CIEE. The latter's programs, however, while involving some reciprocity, for example, through supporting university heads and professors to come to the United States, do not aim at equality in the numbers and categories of persons exchanged.

U.S. academic exchanges with East Central European higher education institutions differ from those with the Soviet Union in a number of other respects:

- The former are not so commonly situated in capital/major cities as with the Soviet exchanges, but are more dispersed, especially in Yugoslavia, Poland, and East Germany;

- The agreements with East Central European institutions tend to have less specificity in setting forth the host institutions' obligations, and allow for more flexibility in the time periods for individual sojourns and during which exchanges should be balanced, and in the levels of exchangees, and;

- The U.S. institutions having academic exchanges with East Central European countries seem to rely more heavily on external rather than institutional funding to support them than do U.S. exchanges with Soviet institutions. The obstacles and problems which U.S.-ECE academic exchanges face, while somewhat comparable or parallel to those impeding U.S.-Soviet exchanges, are, in many instances, either less in scope or less intransigent, as suggested below.

- While air travel by East Central European scholars and students coming to the United States from some ECE countries can be paid for in the home currency when using an American carrier (in contrast to the U.S.S.R.), antiquated telephone systems, postal delays, and the dearth of fax and electronic mail facilities hamper communication between the United States and East Central European institutions, but less so for the more advanced countries, and an electronic mail system may become available in 1991;

- For U.S. scholars and students to obtain East Central European visas takes much less time than obtaining Soviet visas, and the same applies for ECE scholars and students to enter the United States;

- Whether the availability of appropriate and affordable housing accommodation is a problem in East Central European-U.S. academic exchanges depends very much on the host institutions and city abroad, and is often less a problem for the ECE universities, because, in contrast to the United States, many traditionally have subsidized housing for visiting scholars;

- Finance, a major obstacle to U.S.-ECE academic exchanges, is less so than for U.S.-Soviet exchanges, both because the currency of some East Central European countries is convertible into dollars, as with Poland and somewhat in Yugoslavia (and Czechoslovakia and probably Hungary in 1991), and because of the more flexible formulae for some of the exchanges (not exactly equal numbers of persons and time periods). The ECE exchanges with the U.S. are also less costly than those with the Soviet Union, because, unlike the latter, they may not require the host U.S. institution to send a staff member to personally meet the ECE visitor at the U.S. port of entry and escort him/her to the college or university, or to subsidize travel to other cities in the United States. Exchange scholars from East Central Europe may also not expect salaries equal to those paid to U.S. professors of equivalent rank and experience, as do some Soviet exchangees. However, because ECE academic salaries are low, the host U.S. institution must plan on covering scholars' living costs, health insurance, and other basic needs;

- Lack of proficiency in the host country's language is another obstacle to East Central European academic exchanges with the United States. As the number of scholars exchanged increases, it may be an increased problem, especially as the role of IREX diminishes in relative (not absolute) terms because of the growing number of exchange scholars whose stay abroad is handled directly by the collaborating institutions rather than administered by IREX. Language preparation and proficiency will, in all probability, become much less of a concern and more of a problem than has been the case with IREX exchanges because of its careful selection and orientation processes.

At the student level, the lack of proficiency in the host country's language is a far greater problem for the Americans than for East Central European students. Not only is English now becoming much more widely taught in ECE schools, replacing formerly compulsory Russian and also German (which was the second foreign language), but, in several countries, English is the medium of instruction in some schools. In Bulgaria, thirty high schools teach in English (still others in French or German). U.S. higher education institutions with East Central European exchanges, unlike many having exchanges with the Soviet Union, assume that the American students will not know the host country's language. While study of the language may be part of the program for the American students, most of the program is taught in English. Some East Central European universities even offer regular courses in English, e.g.

Budapest Technical University, and welcome qualified American students in these courses. As the ECE higher education institutions move towards greater flexibility in their curriculum and teaching approaches, it seems likely that U.S. students may be more motivated to enroll directly in them rather than in separate programs, and to study the East Central European languages in greater numbers than was the case for 1986, the most recent year for which figures were available for this study.

LANGUAGE STUDY ENROLLMENTS IN 1986
IN ALL U.S. FOUR-YEAR AND TWO-YEAR INSTITUTIONS[15]

Bulgarian	19
Czech	193
Hungarian	140
Polish	963
Serbo-Croatian	243
Slovak	32
Slovene	22
Romanian	105
Russian	33,961

The above figures do not show what increases may have taken place in study of the languages as a result of the greatly heightened interest in the countries after the 1989 changes. They also do not show the full extent of student interest or proficiency in the languages as they do not include American students who are already somewhat proficient in the languages from having grown up in families with East Central European origins that spoke the languages in the home. It is frequently these students who are motivated to pursue studies in the ECE countries.

Other important issues affecting U.S.-East Central European academic exchanges are braindrain concerns, the limited pool of potential participants in the United States, and the differences/disjunctions between the higher education systems. These issues are discussed next.

Braindrain

Braindrain concerns, hardly new with the East Central European countries, may prompt the imposition of limits on ECE academic exchanges with the United States. Because exchanges are likely to accelerate the braindrain, some countries may be tempted to apply measures to stem it, such as limiting the time period and number of ECE exchange participants coming to the United States.

In East Central Europe, the braindrain affects the sciences and technology far more than the humanities and social sciences. Frustrated by their low pay and by the lack of research funding, of sophisticated (or in some cases even adequate) laboratory equipment and supplies, and of access to Western publications, young scientists and technologists are understandably attracted to a career in the West. It has been estimated that more Yugoslavian academics are teaching outside of than within Yugoslavia, that as many as one-third of the most qualified specialists in the Institute of Biology of the Bulgarian Academy of Science left

[15]Richard Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments in the U.S. Institutions of Higher Education," *Bulletin*, Volume 19, Number 2 (January 1988), New York: Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, pp. 39-46.

Bulgaria permanently in the first half of 1990, and that twelve percent of the 25,000 academic workforce of Hungary leave that country each year, of whom one-fourth remain abroad more than five years, some permanently.

Comprehensive data on braindrain were not available for this report. One can conjecture that the initial excitement and pace of change in the ECE countries made their students and scholars more optimistic about their countries' and their own future and more committed to keep them joined. However, the deep disillusionment of young people in some of the countries about prospects for improving the quality of their lives, even after the 1989 events, may not augur well for stemming the braindrain problem. That a mere two years ago some eighty percent of university students in Poland wanted to emigrate after finishing their university studies in order to find a better life is still relevant today.

Just as a unified Germany is treating as urgent the need to help strengthen and reform the higher education system of the former GDR in order to avoid a major braindrain of students and scholars from East to West, so, too, is a similar effort urgent for the other ECE countries, even though relocating in the West may be more difficult for their inhabitants than for East Germans. The alternative may be, as one East European scholar aptly described it, "banking" their scientists and other scholars in the West until such time as improved professional and living conditions attract them back to the home country.

Potential Participants

The pool of U.S. students and scholars who constitute potential participants in exchanges with higher education institutions in East Central Europe is much smaller than the pool of ECE students and scholars interested in pursuing studies or research in the United States. This could be a problem if it is assumed that the numbers of exchangees of different levels and categories should be in approximate balance, an assumption more expected by Soviet than ECE institutions and agencies.

Many of the ECE students interested in study in the United States, especially undergraduates, are keen to do a complete degree program. This is true at the graduate level as well, although some students may prefer to spend only one or two years in the United States in order to avail themselves of U.S. laboratory, library, and computer facilities, particularly for doctoral level research. Very few U.S. students, by contrast, are expected to seek a degree in the East Central European countries. The chief exception has been and will probably continue to be Americans seeking medical training who failed to be admitted to a U.S. medical school. Numbers were studying in Romania until a deterioration of living conditions there several years ago, and Hungary and Poland continue to attract these students.

The pool of U.S. faculty interested in professional sojourns in East Central Europe tends to comprise those at the institutions earlier characterized as apt to be involved with the region: institutions with Title VI Soviet and East European Studies Programs, U.S. institutions strong in fields having strength in ECE institutions, faculty members originally from ECE countries who wish to revisit their original homeland and renew ties with and even assist it, and professors in fields such as management, political science, law, economics, and education, who can and want to contribute to, or wish to observe and do research on, the changes underway in areas relevant to their specializations in the ECE countries.

That the pool of potential ECE scholar participants in academic exchanges with the United States is much larger than the corresponding pool of U.S. scholars—but that pool is expand-

ing—has already been suggested in the earlier discussion of ECE interests in academic exchanges with the United States. Whether the ECE higher education institutions can sustain the absence of many of their faculty in the United States and whether the faculty members can find funding for sojourns there are among the major questions surrounding U.S.-ECE academic exchanges.

Differences in Education Systems

The pre-1989 ECE higher education systems were closely modelled on that of the Soviet Union. Comprehensive institutions which had encompassed a number of faculties prior to the post World War II changes introduced by the U.S.S.R. were broken into different institutions, each highly specialized, in such fields as agriculture, economics, art, engineering, etc.

Other important features of pre-1989 higher education included the following: an overloaded schedule of more than thirty class hours per week; very little by way of tutorials and other faculty-student interaction outside of formal lecture sessions; required study of the Russian language; a major role for Communist Party officials in university decision-making; a heavily ideological orientation in social sciences with required courses in Marxism-Leninism; a reliance on end-of-year examinations, often oral, to evaluate student performance rather than continuous assessment or some combination of the two, with high levels of failure and repetition of examinations; little support for faculty research or innovation in teaching; and relatively little exchange with higher education institutions in other countries, whether involving students or faculty members.

The changes in higher education in East Central Europe put forward as priorities or plans in the months after the 1989 events may make exchanges with the West, including the United States, more likely, by bringing the different systems closer together and bridging differences. The relevant changes relate to many aspects of ECE higher education:

1. Communist Party members /officials no longer play a key role in decision-making on major issues such as curriculum, faculty recruitment, and the like. However, it has not been possible to end their role altogether, because so many staff and faculty members felt compelled or were compelled to join the Communist Party in the East Central European universities that terminating them all would deprive the institutions of needed staff. Many have been given early retirement or shifted out of positions in the central administration which often had excessively large staff, mostly party members and members from the secret police.

2. The universities and other higher education institutions now—or soon—will have autonomy with respect to academic policies and practices. Faculty senates at many of the universities now have responsibility for choosing deans, setting curriculum, and the like, and have significant representation of the student body, as in Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

3. Russian is no longer a required language in the ECE countries. Former teachers of Russian are having to learn to teach English or some other high demand subject.

4. As already mentioned, the heavily ideological courses in Marxism-Leninism have been abolished and replaced with courses in political philosophy or with more courses in the student's major field. The large number of faculty members who taught the ideological courses are, in many cases, being given a time period during which they prepare themselves as effective teachers of other kinds of courses.

5. Class hours are being reduced, for example, in Poland from 30-32 to 24-26 per week, and consideration is being given to introducing an academic credit, modular, or comparable system. Students are also being offered more choice in their courses.

6. The higher education systems in East Central Europe, for which access has heretofore been highly restricted (to around 10 percent of the age group) now plan or intend to broaden access in terms of student numbers and entrance requirements.

7. ECE university faculty members are now undertaking more research rather than its being mainly the function of academies of sciences. They are seeking to do more basic rather than primarily applied research, and to be more competitive internationally in this activity. Along with some relative diminution of the role of the academies of science in research is a reduced role in offering advanced degrees, comparable to Kandidat in the U.S.S.R.

8. In most of the ECE countries, there is a movement towards privatizing higher education: students are no longer guaranteed jobs on completing their studies, fewer enterprises sponsor students, some institutions are beginning to or contemplating charging tuition (the University of Sofia Law faculty will charge tuition equivalent to around $1000 per year), and, in some countries, private institutions are being set up, such as Korvin University in Hungary. This phenomenon is also found in the Soviet Union where as many as eight independent universities are planned or already operating.

9. All of the ECE countries are now eager, in some cases almost desperate, for academic exchanges, and, after decades of isolation, look to them as an important means to help strengthen and bring change in their higher education systems. Increasingly, the ECE institutions are seeking ways to count a semester or academic year spent by their students at institutions abroad towards their own degree requirements. Their participation in the European Community's new TEMPUS Program (Trans-European Mobility Program for European Studies), which offers grants to ECE students to pursue higher education studies in EC institutions for at least six months, seems likely to encourage the recognition of studies carried out elsewhere.

The changes now underway in ECE higher education, including in the Soviet Union, insofar as they bring greater choice and flexibility to academic programs, should enable international educational exchanges to increase not only in scope but in their contribution to ECE students' profiting from the teaching of visiting U.S. faculty and to the professional development of both the ECE and U.S. faculty involved.

Some Major Issues and Recommendations for the Future

The task of identifying major issues and proposing recommendations for the future on academic exchanges between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and ECE is rendered difficult, if not perilous, by the rapidly evolving situation in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. National stability and even survival in some cases are threatened by ethnic rivalries and conflicts, as in Yugoslavia and the Balkans, demands for political decentralization, as in the U.S.S.R., and the desperate plight of the economies in these countries, especially in Romania and the Soviet Union. The rapid changes in the higher education systems—although perhaps not rapid enough for some—may make recommendations formulated today inappropriate for or even irrelevant to tomorrow. Moreover, it is hard to conceive how the Soviet and ECE higher education institutions can pursue the urgent needs to revise curriculum, retrain, reassign, or retire teaching staff in the ideological fields now removed from or redefined in the curriculum, and institute new governance structures, while at the same time developing academic exchanges with the Western nations, including the United States. But these institutions are indeed engaged in such efforts, admittedly some more actively than others, e.g. in the Soviet Union the teacher training institutions are slower to change. In all these efforts, the American higher education establishment can contribute and, as is emphasized later, should significantly expand its support.

This final section of the report deals in sequence first with the two major issues of information and funding needs and resources, and concludes with some recommendations.

Information Needs and Resources

The long decades of isolation between the Soviet and ECE higher education institutions and peoples (except for Yugoslavia and, to a lesser extent, Poland) and their U.S. counterparts have left a legacy of mutual ignorance. If more academic exchanges of both students and faculty are to develop, there must be much more mutual knowledge of each other's education systems at a very practical level.

With respect to students, this involves not only knowing the "mesh" between systems—how degrees and other qualifications as well as types of institutions do or do not equate or compare—but also qualitative assessments of individual institutions and academic programs—requirements for admission to different institutions and programs and at different levels, costs, and whether any financial support might be available and based on what criteria. To be even more concrete, for U.S. higher education institutions to which Soviet students may apply for graduate study, this can mean being aware that Soviet higher education institutions

tend not to provide academic transcripts or letters of recommendation for their students, and that the scarcity of photocopying facilities and paper makes obtaining a photocopy of a diploma extremely difficult.

With respect to exchanges of researchers and faculty members, much more knowledge is needed in both the United States and in the Soviet Union and ECE of the research strengths and specializations in different disciplines of each other's higher education and research institutions and institutes. The inability of the Soviet and ECE institutions to subscribe to professional and scientific journals requiring hard currency payments has prevented their having access to U.S. research in many fields. While a not insignificant degree of mutual knowledge had developed through Fulbright and IREX exchanges—taking those with the U.S.S.R. only, around fifteen university lecturers exchanged annually each way under the Fulbright Program, and 60-70 U.S. and 75-90 Soviet graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and senior research scholars in IREX exchanges of several months or more—much more mutual knowledge is needed if exchanges are to expand in their scope and value to the institutions concerned. As put forward in the concluding recommendations to this study, Fulbright returnees should be deliberately utilized to a much greater extent in expanding the knowledge base in the United States and the Soviet Union-ECE on each other's higher education systems and institutions. As is also urged later, the role of IREX in information dissemination and as a broker in expanding academic exchanges should be a major contributor in meeting information needs.

A range of activities and developments are underway in an effort to help meet the kinds of informational needs outlined above:

- The PIER (Projects for International Education Research) program of AACRAO (American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) and NAFSA: Association of International Educators produced reports in mid/late 1990 on the educational systems of the Republic of Hungary, Yugoslavia, and East Germany (prior to its unification with the Federal Republic of Germany) which provide information and guidance to U.S. colleges and universities pertinent to the admission and placement of students from these countries. A similar volume on the Soviet Union will be available in late 1991, a report on the educational systems of Poland and Czechoslovakia, in spring 1992.

- IREX and the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) currently have funding from the U.S. Information Agency (and IREX also from the Soros Foundation) to provide advisory services in the Soviet Union on U.S. higher education through their offices in Moscow and, more widely, through networking, consulting, and disseminating information, including to Soviet universities. Through an agreement with the Educational Testing Service (ETS), ACTR administers TOEFL and GRE in Moscow, but only after a pre-screening of candidates, because of the need to keep numbers to a realistic level and limits on the vouchering of test fees (accepting payment in rubles). ACTR also coordinates TOEFL and GRE testing centers in Leningrad, Kiev, and Vilnius.

- In cooperation with USIA, the Soros Foundation has opened student advising centers in Hungary (in Budapest and at provincial universities). The foundation paid for installation of Peterson's Guides hardware and software, including CD ROM, to enable clientele to access the U.S. college and university community. Similar resources are currently available or soon will be available in Moscow, Estonia, and Bulgaria. They may be available in the future in other locations in ECE, but definite information is not available at this time.

- IREX also is opening offices in Bucharest and Prague, which will similarly provide advisory services and facilitate educational exchanges between the United States and East European countries. Since 1988, IREX also has taken on an expanded brokering role between Soviet and U.S. higher education in identifying, counseling, and placing Soviet students in doctoral programs in the social sciences at U.S. universities, and in being willing to admit and fund these students, as is elaborated later.

- With USIA support, the new office of the Institute of International Education (IIE) in Budapest is assisting advising offices in ECE with information on U.S. higher education, admissions requirements, and the like; on behalf of ETS, this IIE office will facilitate access to the TOEFL examination in East Central Europe. IIE also is initiating an East Central European Information Exchange to collect and disseminate information on developments, needs, and resources relating to U.S. academic exchanges with the region.

- The Council on International Educational Exchange provides information and counsel relating to study abroad programs and exchanges through the offices of its study abroad programs in Leningrad, Warsaw, Budapest, and Prague.

The new or expanded information dissemination and counseling efforts outlined above are important in helping to supplement the ongoing activities of the United States Information Service offices in the Soviet Union and the East Central European countries. Requests for information at these offices have skyrocketed since 1989, with over 4,000 student requests at USIS, Prague, just in the period from January to late April 1990. Inquiries in Bulgaria about study in the United States increased by more than 400 percent in the first half of 1990 compared to 1989. And in Moscow in fall 1990, telephone inquiries to USIS about study in the United States virtually blocked out all other incoming calls and had to be diverted elsewhere. Despite their valiant efforts, USIS offices are not able to cope with the escalating volume of inquiries about study and research in the United States, as they lack the necessary staff, space, and support structure. The new American cultural centers planned for Moscow and Warsaw, to offer resources in libraries, student counseling, and English language and culture programs, while important additions, are nevertheless not apt to meet the growing demand.

A major information need experienced both by the Soviet and ECE higher education institutions and by U.S. colleges and universities is for data and guidance on how to identify or choose institutions in the other country/region with which to undertake academic cooperation and exchange. How can a Soviet or ECE university decide among a series of U.S. institutions seeking exchanges when it has little information on the institutions or understanding of how academic quality is assessed and assured in the American system? This dilemma has faced many ECE and Soviet universities, especially the relatively few which are better known in the United States, including one in Poland, which was visited by sixty-eight U.S. university delegations within a single week in fall 1990!

Conversely, how can a U.S. institution decide on an exchange partner in the U.S.S.R. or East Central Europe when information on it, even a course catalog, is not available in English or may be lacking altogether? That the Soviets and East Central Europeans tend much more to be "face-to-face" societies than are Americans—so that agreements on and the implementation of academic exchanges require considerable personal interchange and reciprocal visits between the parties—imposes an additional challenge, even burden, on U.S. universities in making choices of partner institutions. The informal as well as formal discussions between ECE and U.S. (and West European) higher education leaders, which took place at the Univer-

sity of Hartford conference in October 1989 in conjunction with the Helsinki conference of the International Association of Universities in August 1990, both with the American Council on Education and other sponsorship, were important in facilitating such interchange.

Funding Needs and Resources

Earlier sections of this report have underscored the urgent need of the Soviet and ECE higher education institutions for additional financial resources if they are to expand academic exchanges. With few exceptions, their students, teaching staff, and administrators cannot spend time in the United States without external funding. Apart from U.S. government sources, this funding falls into the following categories:

❑ U.S. colleges and universities provide full support except for international travel for persons from partner institutions on the basis of equal numbers of persons, time periods, etc. in the exchange, as with the Middlebury College-administered exchange with the U.S.S.R., the American Collegiate Consortium.

❑ Soviet and ECE institutions support their staff in the United States with dollars paid to them by American colleges and universities—and more and more by individual U.S. students—to cover board, room, tuition, and other costs to participate in study programs at the Soviet-ECE institutions.

❑ U.S. colleges and universities offer full funding for Soviet or ECE students to pursue short-term or degree studies at these institutions. Far less likely for undergraduates than graduate students, some undergraduates are finding support, e.g. at the private colleges having scholarships for foreign undergraduates such as Macalester and Brandeis. At the graduate level, Soviet-ECE students may be given teaching or research assistantships which cover all basic costs. IREX has had impressive success through its collaboration with the American Sociological Association and other professional associations in the social sciences in securing admission and full support for Soviet students to pursue doctoral degree studies at a range of distinguished U.S. universities: 43 in economics, political science, and sociology for 1990-91, 17 in sociology in 1989-90, the first year of this program.

❑ Various foundations are supporting academic exchanges involving the United States and the Soviet Union and/or East Central Europe. One of the most active, the Soros Foundation, headquartered in New York with branches in the Soviet Union and Hungary, dispensed $20 million from 1984-90 for projects involving Hungary, including professional development opportunities abroad for professors from the Budapest (formerly Karl Marx) University of Economic Sciences, and partial support of the International Management Center in Budapest, to which the University of Pittsburgh sends rotating professors of management and business.

Other U.S.-based foundations which support Soviet and ECE programs, including academic exchanges with the United States, include the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. A priority with much of the foundations' funding has been economic reform and management training.

❑ IREX has been and continues to be an important source of support for senior scholars, postdoctoral researchers, and advanced graduate students from the U.S.S.R. and East Central Europe to pursue studies or research in the United States, and for American counterparts to do the same in the Soviet Union and ECE. While IREX, a non-governmental organiza-

tion closely linked with its two major sponsors, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), receives substantial funding from the U.S. Information Agency and the National Endowment for the Humanities, as well as from private foundations, it is largely autonomous in its functioning. As the number of academic exchanges between the Soviet-ECE and the United States have multiplied, the share handled by IREX has diminished.

Turning to the public sector, some of the U.S. government programs which fund international education, exchange, and research are now giving more support for activities targeted at the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. Some new programs have been launched directly towards these countries. Existing programs which continue to support or are increasing their support include:

1)The Fulbright senior scholar and graduate student programs and the Fulbright teacher exchange. Although numbers of grantees have not greatly increased, the expansion in breadth of activity and disciplinary fields in 1990-91 and anticipated in 1991-92 is impressive. ECE institutions are wanting U.S. scholars in the social sciences dramatically more than pre-1989. Business, political institutions, international law, journalism, and sociology are among the high demand fields. U.S. universities and faculty members are, it appears, anxious to respond.

2) The International Visitor Program of the U.S. Information Agency. The numbers of persons coming to the United States from the Soviet Union and East Central Europe under the International Visitor Program of the U.S. Information Agency has increased well over 200 percent since pre-1989.

3) The Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE), which, in its increasing priority to international education, encouraged in its fall 1990 guidelines the collaboration of U.S. higher education institutions with those in East Central Europe through the ECE's TEMPUS program.

4) The University Affiliation or Linkages Program of the U.S. Information Agency, which funded five new inter-university exchanges between American colleges and universities and U.S.S.R.-ECE higher education institutions in 1989-90 and again in 1990-91 at $50,000-60,000 each per year over a three-year period; although funding limitations precluded supporting more projects in 1990-91, the number of applications involving these countries sharply increased.

5) Other programs receiving U.S. government funding, which support academic exchanges between the United States and U.S.S.R.-ECE, and may now have increased support are: the East European Exchange Program of the National Science Foundation, the East European Program of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (only half of the Center's funding is federal), and the National Council for Soviet and East European Research.

6) International education and exchange programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education, in which serious consideration is being given to encouraging Title VI centers for Soviet/East European studies to develop linkages with higher education institutions in the countries concerned, and to identifying ways to bring collaboration between U.S. and ECE institutions through TEMPUS. It is also of interest that applications for the Department of Education-administered doctoral dissertation fellowships have rebounded world-wide, from around 300 annually in the last few years back up to the 500 range of the 1960's, including

many applications having to do with the U.S.S.R. and ECE.

The new government-supported programs to fund international exchange with the Soviet Union and/or East Central Europe include:

1) The Samantha Smith program to support secondary school and undergraduate student exchanges, initiated in 1988, with $2 million per year;

2) The Alexander Hamilton fellowship program for young managers from the ECE countries (except Yugoslavia) to pursue business studies in the United States;

3) The John Marshall Program to enable young law specialists from the same ECE countries to pursue studies of constitutional law and legal theory at U.S. law schools;

4) The 1989-90 SEED (Support for East European Democracy) I program, primarily to train persons from Poland and Hungary in management skills, which was administered in large part by the Agency for International Development. SEED II, which is to extend SEED I kinds of assistance to all the East Central European countries with the exception of Romania, had not been passed by Congress by late 1990. However, the FY1991 Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act signed by President Bush in November 1990 provides $369.675 million for special assistance to Eastern Europe, including some support for scholarship programs (amount not specified in the Act).

To put the U.S. financial support of academic exchanges with the ECE countries into perspective, it should be noted that the European Community launched a new program to assist Poland and Hungary through educational exchanges soon after it was evident that their political regimes were undergoing fundamental modification. The new program, PHARE (Poland-Hungary Assistance in Research and Education), was expanded in mid 1990 to include the other ECE countries (but not Romania) in TEMPUS (Trans-European Mobility for University Studies). TEMPUS encourages and funds programs of cooperation and exchange between higher education institutions of the European Community and ECE. This includes exchanges of students and teaching staff, cooperation on curricular matters, participation in training programs and conferences, and collaborative projects involving higher education institutions and industry.

To qualify for TEMPUS funding, a project must involve at least two West European institutions and one East European. The hope and expectation for TEMPUS is that, after five years, East Central European countries could join ERASMUS, the academic exchange program of the European Community, which, in only a few years, has had a major impact within the European Community countries and elsewhere as an exciting model.

The funding for TEMPUS, the equivalent of around $125 million for 1991, impressive as it is (although apparently only able to support a disappointingly low proportion of requests), represents only a fraction of the West European commitment to collaboration with the ECE higher education institutions. The various countries are deeply involved with programming and funding individually, quite apart from their participation in European Community efforts. The British Council has developed some special programs, including the Know-How program, with polytechnics. As another example, with the University of London, the cultural relations department of the U.K. Foreign and Commonwealth Office is jointly supporting 200 months of study by East European students at that university at a cost of around $260,000 to the Foreign Office and $300,000 to the university.

NUFFIC (the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation) is also playing an active role, and both the German and French governments are similarly making major contributions to academic exchanges with the ECE countries' institutions and programs, in keeping with their historical and intellectual ties with some of these countries.

It is beyond the scope of this report to attempt comparisons between the performance of the United States and that of western Europe in terms of financial support by governmental bodies for academic exchanges and cooperation with higher education institutions in the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. It seems clear, however, that in the view of academic leaders in the United States and in the ECE countries, the U.S. government response to the new opportunities and needs in these countries has been perceived as late and limited. Such was the message conveyed by the ECE rectors and other senior higher education officials at the special meeting organized by the American Council on Education at the end of the IAU conference in Helsinki in August 1990. However, as suggested by Robert H. Atwell, ACE's president, part of this perception can no doubt be attributed to certain basic features of U.S. higher education, namely: it includes over 3,400 very diverse institutions, the system is highly decentralized, and, at the federal level, there is nothing comparable to a Ministry of Education in other countries.

The apparently slow and uncoordinated U.S. response also was seen as inadequate in contrast to the rapid response of the European Community in launching TEMPUS. The EC rapid response was helped by there being in place the international exchange scheme of the European Community, ERASMUS. Launched in 1987 and developed out of the earlier Joint Study Programmes between European Community countries, by 1990 ERASMUS already had an excellent track record which eased its extension to East Central Europe through TEMPUS.

Recommendations

❑ Probably the most important step for strengthening U.S. academic exchanges with the Soviet Union and East Central Europe would be for the American colleges and universities to think through in the most systematic and thorough way possible whether a proposed new exchange—or an existing one—is sufficiently in the interest of the U.S. institution to warrant initiating or maintaining it. Questions should be asked such as, would the benefits accruing to U.S. faculty and/or students justify the cost in staff time and actual funds? A substantial base of faculty support should be an essential condition for any academic exchange.

❑ Exchange relationships and agreements should provide reciprocal benefits for both parties. Exchanges in which one institution benefits much more than the other, for example, in accruing more funds from the exchange than are made available to the other, are not only exploitative and inequitable, but also are not apt to last.

❑ U.S. colleges and universities should be encouraged to collaborate in consortial approaches towards Soviet-ECE academic exchanges. This would enhance the U.S. institutions' leverage in negotiating with Soviet-ECE institutions, help limit the number of U.S. colleges and universities each seeking its own relationship, and facilitate the participation of more U.S. institutions by including many which could not afford or sustain their own separate academic exchange.

❑ Although there is no one best model for exchange agreements between the U.S. and

Soviet institutions or between U.S. and ECE institutions, a good model for an exchange sending American undergraduates to an ECE country which merits replication is the following: the U.S. students pay to their sending U.S. institutions normal home costs for tuition, fees, board, and room minus the cost of whatever they must pay for these items while in the host country. The Soviet or ECE institution may spend the funds accumulated from U.S. student fees paid for study abroad when and as it sees fit, except that both institutions must approve the candidates recommended to them (students or faculty) by their exchange institution.

❑ Both higher education institutions, as parties to an exchange agreement, should monitor its implementation consistently and in detail. This would, for example, help to avoid a situation in which one of the institutions (or an individual department or faculty member) invites a faculty member from the other to come visit and lecture, only to discover when it expects one of its professors to be hosted reciprocally that the central authorities of the first institution were never informed of or agreed to such an obligation. Not having budgeted for it, they may not be able to honor it, which can seriously undermine the relationship.

❑ In light of the considerable diversity among exchange agreements between U.S. and Soviet or ECE institutions, especially in the level of support offered to visiting students/scholars in both directions, model agreements should be drafted and disseminated as part of the clearing house effort mentioned below.

❑ U.S. colleges and universities should be encouraged to enter into and support academic exchanges with Soviet and East Central European higher education institutions both to help them overcome the effects of decades of isolation and because of the benefits, itemized earlier in this study, to be gained by the U.S. institutions.

❑ To facilitate the admission of more Soviet and ECE students to American colleges and universities, the number of centers administering the ETS admission test should be rapidly expanded in areas where none or few exist. Meanwhile, as suggested by Adeline C. O'Connell, Chief of Advising, Teaching, and Specialized Programs at the U.S. Information Agency, "The admissibility of Eastern European and Soviet students might, for instance, be measured by something other than expensive standardized tests."[16]

❑ U.S. higher education institutions with graduate programs should, as with graduate students from the People's Republic of China after normalization, give graduate applicants from the Soviet Union and ECE the benefit of the doubt by accepting them for graduate study until such time as experience may discredit this approach. This recommendation derives from the fact that the largest source of funding for foreign students is assistantships at the graduate level (allegedly some 30,000 students from China now receive an estimated $125 million from this source).

The situation may not be comparable, however, in that, unlike the students from China who are overwhelmingly in the sciences and engineering (fields with a dearth of American graduate students), Soviet and ECE students are apparently eager to concentrate in such fields as business, economics, and, increasingly, in political science, philosophy, and ethics, as the Soviet and ECE institutions replace Marxist-Leninist ideology with a range of subjects, including so-called "politology."

---

[16] "Letters to the Editor," *The New York Times*, August 2, 1990.

❑ The new opening up of the East Central European countries should be seized as an opportunity to encourage more study in the United States of the languages of these countries at the pre-collegiate and collegiate levels.

❑ The Soviet and East Central European higher education institutions should strengthen their administrative offices which handle educational exchanges, especially in ensuring adequate professional expertise. Funding should be made available from the U.S. government, foundations, and other sources to support a role in this effort for NAFSA: The Association of International Educators.

❑ Despite funding constraints with the U.S. federal government—the hoped-for "peace dividend" from the end of the Cold War having vanished with the Gulf crisis—increased federal funding of academic exchanges with the U.S.S.R.-ECE is urgent and appropriate. The understandable priorities of the U.S. government and a number of foundations for activities that encourage market-oriented economies, multi-party democracies, independent media, and private sector development should not exclude support for academic exchanges in the humanities and in social science fields other than economics. They are essential to the mutual knowledge and understanding which is the foundation for effectively pursuing the above-mentioned activities.

❑ It is in connection with academic exchanges to advance mutual knowledge and understanding that the International Research and Exchanges Board has for so long played a key role and should continue to do so. Clearly, however, its role in the future cannot follow closely that of the past, because IREX is no longer and cannot be expected to be the chief conduit for U.S. academic exchanges with the Soviet Union and much of East Central Europe. At the same time, IREX has a fund of knowledge and expertise which is invaluable in the negotiation and implementation of academic exchanges, especially those targeted at research. Its record in identifying, placing, and supporting scholars from the United States to pursue research in the Soviet Union or East Central Europe, and vice-versa, should not be permitted to atrophy with the new proliferation of exchanges of all kinds. As the needs and prospects for expanding knowledge of the U.S.S.R. and ECE become greater, not fewer, with glasnost, federal and other support for IREX should also expand to help keep pace with these expanding needs and prospects.

❑ A U.S.-based clearinghouse should be established in the near future to focus on academic exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union and East Central Europe. It would fulfill an invaluable role, at least for the next five years or so, while the higher educational institutions in those countries adapt to their post-cold war situation.

The clearinghouse would collect and disseminate information on higher education institutions and programs in all the countries concerned. It could advise U.S. and Soviet-ECE institutions on the kinds of institutions in the other countries which might be appropriate partners for different kinds of exchanges. On request, the clearinghouse could provide models for exchange agreements and could suggest consultants to advise institutions about exchange relationships. The clearinghouse should also identify topics and issues relating to academic exchanges on which more information or evaluation is needed, and bring these to the attention of appropriate other bodies. The proposed clearinghouse would, of course, have to work closely with the other organizations already playing a role relevant to the clearinghouse operation, such as PIER, IREX, and NAFSA.

Whether parallel to or part of the clearinghouse operation, conferences and other meetings should be regularly arranged at which the leadership of higher education institutions and organizations in the United States and the Soviet Union and East Central Europe can come together on a partner basis for formal and informal discussion of shared concerns and exchange relationships and needs. The program of the Pew Higher Education Research Program, sponsored by the Pew Charitable Trusts, to bring together heads of Eastern and Western European universities with U.S. counterparts for meetings on educational reform, is helping to meet an important need, but still more such efforts should be instituted.

The proposed clearinghouse and regular meetings of higher education leadership would be important in updating and adapting knowledge, programs, and policies to changing developments and needs in higher education institutions and systems. They could also be significant in providing input to and assessments for private sector organizations, foundations, and government agencies and bodies in the U.S., as they determine policies and programs relating to the Soviet Union and East Central Europe and to academic exchanges with them. For example, if the proposed clearinghouse and regular meetings were already a reality, the unduly negative image of Romania in the United States might have been modified so that it is no longer excluded from certain economic and other federal aid.

This last remark serves to underscore yet again the unpredictabilities pertinent to U.S. academic exchanges with the Soviet Union and East Central European countries. Not the least of these are if and when the Soviet Union becomes officially known as the Soviet Republics, and Albania, already since May 1990 pursuing democratization and free market objectives, follows the other ECE countries in ceasing to be a Communist-governed country.

APPENDIX I
STRATEGY OF THE STUDY

The following approaches were followed in obtaining information and insights on the experience and interests of the individuals and institutions involved or desirous of being involved in the exchanges which are the focus of this study:

1) Interviews with Cultural Affairs Officials at the Embassies in Washington, D.C. of a number of the East Central European countries;

2) Interviews with current and former staff at the U.S. Information Agency and other U.S. government agencies;

3) A survey of the U.S. university Soviet and East European Studies Centers funded by Title VI of the Higher Education Act in terms of their experience and interests in academic exchanges;

4) Interviews with visiting scholars to U.S. universities from the U.S.S.R. and East Central Europe about developments in their home and host countries.

5) Consultations at the U.S. organizations which are particularly active in or concerned about higher education exchanges with the region: the Council on International Educational Exchanges (CIEE), the Institute of International Education (IIE), the Council on International Exchange of Scholars (CIES), and, especially, the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX).

6) Examination of the relevant literature and reports about U.S. and Soviet and East Central European scholars on their exchange experiences in the countries concerned. Especially helpful was *U.S.-Soviet Cultural Exchanges, 1958-1986: Who Wins?* by Yale Richmond (Boulder and London: Westview Press, 1987).

7) Visits to the Soviet Union and to all of the Central and East European countries, except East Germany, Romania, and Albania, for interviews with: university rectors, deans, professors, and international relations staff, higher education government and academy officials, Cultural Affairs staff at the American Embassies and some American or bi-national centers, Fulbright Program staff, and local university students and U.S. students in the countries.

8) Interviews with a number of rectors and other senior administrators from ECE universities at the August 1990 Helsinki conference of the International Association of Universities.

For the assistance and cooperation of this wide range of organizations and persons, the writer is profoundly grateful. The difficulty of obtaining information and the rapid pace of change inevitably limit the comprehensiveness and contemporaneity of this report. It is hoped, nevertheless, that it will aid efforts to expand inter-university exchanges involving the Soviet Union and East Central Europe, and possibly other regions as well.

APPENDIX II

AGREEMENT ON SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY OF LOWELL, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A., AND TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY, U.S.S.R.

To initiate the development and strengthening of friendly relations, the University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University express the desire of the faculties of the two universities for fruitful cooperation in the spheres of science, technology, and culture.

I.

The University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University agree in the interest of comprehensive cooperation: to exchange university journals, publications, and information on problems of education, these materials to be mailed by the libraries of the two universities participating in the agreement in accordance with the requests of both parties and on their own initiative, taking account of the scientific and academic interests of the two sides.

II.

The University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University will engage in scientific and cultural exchange and cooperation of mutual advantage within the framework of the overall agreement on scientific and cultural relations between the governments of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, as follows:

Exchange of faculty and/or graduate students to conduct scientific research and humanistic studies, including lectures, joint scientific investigations, and cultural studies.

1. The University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University may send each other up to two graduate students or post-doctoral fellows for a period of up to one academic year to conduct research in the fields of scientific, humanistic, and social studies. The receiving university will help the visiting graduate student or fellow as needed to improve his or her knowledge of the language of the receiving country.
2. The two parties may exchange two faculty members for a period of up to three months each, or a single faculty member for a period of up to six months.
3. The participating universities promise to provide to the exchange participants free use of materials in their university libraries, including those necessary for educational purposes.
4. The University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University will provide free of charge lodgings on or close to the university grounds to all categories of participants in the exchange and their families.

5. In accordance with the agreed program of research, the University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University will provide up to two trips to other universities outside Lowell and Tbilisi, respectively, with transportation and lodgings paid for by the host university.

6. The host universities will arrange one-day excursions and cultural activities for the participants in the exchange.

7. University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University will provide the participants in all categories of the exchange, in accordance with this agreement, free medical care, including medicines, and, if necessary, hospitalization. This provision, however, does not include dental work or the treatment of acute developments resulting from chronic diseases.

8. The sending university will pay for round trip fare to and from Boston and Tbilisi for the visiting participant.

   The host university will arrange for the visitors to be met and escorted upon arrival and departure, but will not bear expenses for travel and support of family members.

9. The host university will pay monthly stipends from the first day of arrival to all categories of participants, in amounts stipulated by the two governments in their scientific and cultural exchange agreements.

10. The aforesaid agreement will take effect from the time of signing, and will be valid for a period of two years. In the event that neither side expresses a desire to terminate or change the agreement within a period of six months prior to date of expiration, the agreement will automatically remain in effect for another two year period.

11. The English and Russian texts of this agreement are both signed, convey the same meaning, and have equal validity.

For the University of Lowell

_____

President John B. Duff
June 1, 1979

For Tbilisi State University

_____

Rector D. Chkhikvishili
June 1, 1979

PROGRAM OF ACTIVITIES
FOR SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNIVERSITY OF LOWELL, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, U.S.A., AND TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY U.S.S.R., 1 JANUARY, 1980 TO 31 DECEMBER, 1981.

In accordance with the Agreement for Scientific and Cultural Cooperation, the University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University have decided on the following Program of Activities for the period 1 January, 1980 to 31 December, 1981, with the purpose of widening and deepening scientific ties and friendships.

I.

The University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University will exchange materials, bibliographies, and abstracts concerning educational and scientific matters published by the two universities.

II.

The University of Lowell may host up to four faculty members (two per year) for lecturing and scientific and cultural exchange in accordance with any of the following fields of specialization:

First year: Nuclear Physics and/or Engineering Psychology.
Second year: Theoretical Physics and/or Physiology of Plants (Photosynthesis).

Tbilisi State University may host up to two faculty members per year, to be designated by the University of Lowell, for lecturing and scientific research.

III.

The University of Lowell and Tbilisi State University may exchange up to two graduate students from each side for a period of up to 10 months each.

IV.

The financial arrangements affecting all participants in the exchange will be as stipulated by the Agreement on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation signed this day.

V.

This Program of Activities does not exclude other cooperative activities which may be agreed upon in addition to those stipulated.

The English and Russian texts of this program are both signed, convey the same meaning, and have equal validity.

For the University of Lowell

President John B. Duff
June 1, 1979

For Tbilisi State University

Rector D. Chkhikvishili
June 1, 1979

APPENDIX III

SOVIET AND U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS WITH COLLABORATIVE EXCHANGE ARRANGEMENTS

	Range of Institutions
American Collegiate Consortium (based at Middlebury College)	
American University (The)	Moscow State University (Law School)
Architectural Institute of California	Moscow Architectural Institute
Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (13)	Moscow State Institute for International Relations, Diplomatic Academy
University of Arizona, Tucson	Turkmen State University
Bentley College	Estonian Management Institute
California Institute of Technology	Moscow State University Moscow Aviation Institute
California State University at Northridge	Dniepropetrovsk State University, Ukraine
University of California	Herzen Institute Leningrad State University
Central Michigan University [1]	Vilnius State University
Dartmouth College	Kazan State University Moscow Institute of Chemical Technology Moscow State University
Dickinson College	Moscow Institute of Chemical Technology
Emory University	Moscow State University (Journalism Fac.)
Fordham University	Kiev International Management Institute
Goucher College	Odessa State University
Harvard College[1]	Kiev State University
University of Illinois, Urbana	Irkutsk State University
Indiana University	Moscow State University
	Uzbek Institute of Language and Literature

University of Iowa	Torez Institute of Linguistics, now Moscow University of Linguistics
John B. Stetson University, Fla.	Moscow State University
Johns Hopkins University	Moscow Chemistry Institute (Mendelev)
Keene State College	Belgorod Pedagogical Institute
Kent State University	Vilnius University Volgograd State University
University of Kansas	Lunacharsky State Institute of Theater Arts
Lafayette College[1]	Kishinev State University
Lewis and Clark College	Khabarovsk Pedagogical Institute
Lindenwood College[1]	Azerbaijan State University
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Chernovitsk State University
University of Maine System[1]	Kharkov State University
University of Maryland	Moscow Physics and Technical Institute
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	Leningrad Polytechnic Institute
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Moscow Aviation Institute
University of Michigan[1]	Lvov State University
University of Minnesota	G.V. Plekhanov Leningrad Mining Institute Leningrad State Conservatory Moscow State University
University of Minnesota, Duluth	Petrozavodsk State University
University of Missouri	Moscow State University
MUCIA (8 institutions)	Moscow State University
University of North Carolina[1]	Rostov-on-Don State University
Northeastern University	Moscow Institute of National Economy Moscow State University
Northern Illinois University	Azerbaijan State University Tbilisi State University
Northwestern University	Rostov State University
Notre Dame University	Leningrad State University Moscow State University
Ohio State University	Pushkin Institute of Russian Language
Oregon State University	Kiev Polytechnic Institute
Pacific Lutheran University	Estonian Business School Kaunas Polytechnic Institute Riga Polytechnic

University of Pittsburgh	Institute of Economics and Industrial Engineering, Novosibirsk Moscow State University
Portland State	Khabarovsk Institute of National Economy
Purdue University	Pushkin Institute of Russian Language
Rutgers University	Moscow State University
Saint Norbert College	Kharkov Polytechnic Institute
Santa Clara University[1]	Donetsk State University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Latvian State Conservatory
University of South Florida[1]	Kiev Polytechnic Institute
University of Southern Mississippi	Moscow Avtodorozhnyj Institute
Stanford University[1]	Novosibirsk State University
Stonehill College	Yaroslav State University
State University of New York at Albany	Moscow State University Thorez Institute of Foreign Languages
Tennessee Technological University[1]	Leningrad Electro-Tech Institute
University of Texas, Austin[1]	Irkutsk State University Novosibirsk State University
Tufts University	Moscow State University
Wake Forest University	Moscow State University
George Washington University	Moscow Aviation Institute
University of Washington	Tashkent University
Western Michigan University	Latvia State University
University of West Virginia	Novosibirsk State University
Williams College[1]	Tbilisi State University
University of Wisconsin, La Crosse	Riga Polytechnic
University of Wisconsin, Madison	Moscow State University
University of Wyoming[1]	Moscow Institute of Oil and Gas
Yale University[1]	Moscow State University

1. Participating U.S. institution in pairing program of the Citizen Exchange Council with Soviet institutions. Extent of collaboration varies among the paired institutions, as with other collaborative exchange arrangements included in this listing. The listing does not claim to be exhaustive because of the rapid change in the field.

APPENDIX IV

COLLABORATIVE EXCHANGE AGREEMENTS BETWEEN U.S. AND EAST CENTRAL EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Bulgaria

University of California, Los Angeles	Sofia University
University of Delaware	Sofia University
University of Pittsburgh	Sofia University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Sofia University

Czechoslovakia

Boston University	Tomas Masaryk University
City University of New York	Charles University
Cleveland State University	Tomas Masaryk University
Community Colleges for International Development	Technical Institute
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service	Tomas Masaryk University
Indiana University	Charles University
University of Iowa	Agricultural University, Prague
Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies	Charles University
University of Kansas	Charles University
Lehigh University	Charles University
University of Nebraska, Omaha	Charles University
University of Pennsylvania	Institute for the Theory of History and the Arts (Academy of Sciences)
University of Pittsburgh	Charles University Matica Slovenska Institution

49

Texas A & M University	Charles University Comenius University
University of Texas at Austin	Charles University

(Formerly) East Germany

Brown University	University of Rostock
City University of New York/City College	Academy of Pedagogical Sciences
University of Illinois	University of Jena
Johns Hopkins University	Humboldt University, Berlin
Kent State University	Karl Marx University of Leipzig
University of Minnesota	Humboldt University
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	Ernst-Moritz University, Plostock
Northwestern University Medical School	University of Rostock
Tufts University	University of Jena

Hungary

University of California and University of Oregon	Budapest University of Economic Sciences
University of California, Los Angeles	Budapest Technical University
Colorado State University	Budapest Technical University
Columbia University	Budapest Technical University
Community Colleges for International Development	Budapest Technical University
Dartmouth College	Budapest University of Economic Sciences
Drexel University	Budapest Technical University
Graceland College, Iowa	Eotvas Lorand Scientific University
University of Illinois, Chicago	Budapest Technical University
Indiana University	Lajos Kossuth University, Debrecen Semelweis University (Med. Fac.)
Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Janus Pannonius University, Pecs
International Student Exchange Program, Georgetown University	Budapest Technical University Janus Pannonius University
University of Kansas	Janus Pannonius University
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	Janus Pannonius University
Oregon State University	Jozsef Attila University, Szeged

University of Pittsburgh	Budapest University of Economic Sciences
Slippery Rock University	Hungarian Physical Education University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Jozsef Attila University, Szeged
St. John's University	Budapest Technical University
University of Tennessee	Budapest University of Economic Sciences
Virginia Polytechnic and State University	Budapest Technical University
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee	Budapest Technical University

Poland

Alliance College	Jagiellonian University, Krakow
American University	Poznan University
University of Arizona	Warsaw Polytechnic
Ball State University	Agricultural University, Warsaw
Baylor College of Medicine	Medical Academy, Warsaw
California State University, Fresno	Copernicus University
University of California, Berkeley	Jagiellonian University
University of Connecticut	Jagiellonian University, Krakow
Duquesne University	University of Warsaw
University of Detroit	Warsaw Polytechnic
East Illinois University	Agriculture and Pedagogical College
University of Florida, Gainesville	Central School of Planning & Statistics, Warsaw
George Washington University	University of Warsaw
University of Georgia	Jagiellonian University
Grand Valley State College	Economics Academy Krakow
University of Hartford	Jagiellonian University
University of Illinois, Urbana	Lodz University
Indiana University	University of Warsaw
Iowa State University	Agricultural University, Warsaw University of Warsaw
Johns Hopkins University: Bologna Center	Jagiellonian University

University of Kansas	Jagiellonian University University of Warsaw
Kent State University	University of Warsaw
Lock Haven University	Marie Curie Sklodowska University, Lublin
University of Minnesota	Marie Curie Sklodowska University University of Warsaw
Morehead State College	Agricultural University, Warsaw
North Texas State University	Lodz University
Notre Dame University	University of Warsaw
University of Pittsburgh	Economics Academy of Krakow Lodz University University of Gdansk University of Warsaw
Southern Connecticut State University	Jagiellonian University
State University of New York at Stonybrook	Poznan University Warsaw University Wroclaw University
Stanford University	Jagiellonian University
University of Texas at Austin	Krakow Polytechnic Poznan University Warsaw Polytechnic
Texas Tech University, Lubbock	Wroclaw Polytechnic Institute
Virginia Polytechnic and State University	School of Engineering
University of Washington	University of Warsaw
Wayne State University	Jagiellonian University
University of Wisconsin, River Falls	Agricultural University, Warsaw
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point	Jagiellonian University
University of Wisconsin: Medical College, Milwaukee	Jagiellonian University

Romania

University of Alabama	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
University of California, Berkeley	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Case Western Reserve University	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Georgia Institute of Technology	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Illinois Institute of Technology	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest

Lehigh University	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
University of Nebraska	Yash University
University of New Mexico	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Northeastern University	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Stanford University	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Texas A & M University	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest
Western Washington University	Polytechnic Institute of Bucharest

Yugoslavia

Arizona State University, Tempe	Skopje University
California State University, Chico	Skopje University
University of California, Los Angeles	Belgrade University Sarajevo University
Cleveland State University	Ljubljana University
University of Connecticut	Belgrade University
Drury College	Ljubljana University
Eastern Washington University	Veljko Vlahovic University, Titograd
Florida State University, Tallahassee	Belgrade University Veljko Vlahovic University, Titograd
Grand Valley State College	Sarajevo University
Indiana University	Ljubljana University Zagreb University
University of Illinois, Chicago	Belgrade University
Johns Hopkins University	Zagreb University
Lock Haven University	Zagreb University
University of Massachusetts at Amherst	Ljubljana University Maribor University
Murray State University	Sarajevo University
University of Pittsburgh	Belgrade University Ljubljana University Zagreb University
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale	Ljubljana University
State University of New York, Albany	Belgrade University
State University of New York, Potsdam	Ljubljana University
Texas A & M University	Zagreb University

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of Washington
George Washington University

Maribor University
Ljubljana University
Belgrade University